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#### Competitiveness is built on taken-for-granted nationalism---the search for “anticompetitive practices” creates a reinforcing cycle of otherization. Before “prohibiting” anticompetitive life we must ask who we must compete against and who is the “we” that competes.

Pauli Kettunen 21. Professor of Political History in the Social Science Faculty of University of Helsinki. "Welfare state, competition state, security state: Nationalism in nation-state responses to crossborder mobilities." In Remapping Security on Europe’s Northern Borders, pp. 201-220. Routledge, 2021.

Democratic welfare nationalism, competitiveness-seeking nationalism, and security-seeking nationalism appear as rational nation-state policies and are generally not associated with nationalism. It is reasonable to argue that the persistent limits of the conventional use of “nationalism” outside specialist studies of nations and nationalism indicate the power of nationalism as a taken-for-granted mode of thought and action. Taken-for-granted nationalism seems to be reinforced by the intertwining of democratic welfare nationalism with competitiveness-seeking and security-seeking nationalism. There is thus a self-reinforcing circle. The extent to which globalisation is defined as a national challenge reinforces the role of competitiveness and security in political agenda setting, and the extent to which competitiveness and security frame the political agenda assists them to maintain national perspectives to globalisation.

From the welfare-state, competition-state, and security-state perspectives “nationalism” is not a tool for self-description, but for condemning xenophobic and racist far-right nationalism. However, the taken-for-granted nationalism justifying the nation-state limits of these perspectives provides a readymade framework for xenophobic nationalism. The distinctions between us and others and between the internal and external are a shared point of departure, but instead of policies recognising their interdependencies, xenophobic nationalism turns the us-other distinction into an exclusionary us-against-them divide, and the internal-external distinction into a motive for stricter borders.

The emphasis on the national “us” in mainstream modes of combining welfare-state, competition-state, and security-state arguments may facilitate populist protests that accuse the elite of betraying the people. There are similarities with how the nation as an imagined community provided subordinated social groups with the criteria for a collective critique of existing society and created preconditions for the labour movement. However, while the working class was able to motivate its demands by referring to its central role in the production of life’s necessities, the social divides associated with current projects for a national competitive community give little scope for such arguments.

We may find that an insoluble tension appears between what is recognised as the institutional preconditions of competitiveness, and how its content is conceived. At the same time as egalitarian institutions and participatory practices can be defended as preconditions for knowledge-based competitiveness, true membership in a competitive community is a matter of individual competitiveness. This in turn consists of communicative and innovative skills, talent, and a reflexive capacity to monitor oneself from the perspective of competitiveness. Besides winners and losers, some people cannot even participate in this competition.

Individual deficiencies or the unavoidable imperatives of the global economy tend to be offered as explanations for grievances. Welfare-state policies aim to improve individual capacities and compensate for job losses, yet it is far from self-evident that people willingly accept individualised or naturalised explanations. Political implications may be found in constructions demarcating collective threat images and in the support for right-wing populist parties that have managed, not least in the Nordic countries, to merge nostalgic welfare nationalism and xenophobic nationalism.

While the emphasis on “us” in the making of national competitive communities is an integral part of global capitalism, the same transformations may also either erode the solidarity based on common spatial ties or open new crossnational and crossterritorial perspectives for defining “us”. A multicircle non-divisive understanding of “us” would arguably require a transnational democratic dimension in defining problems and solutions. Inspiration may be found in the ideas of policy coordination beyond nation states and European regional integration that Gunnar Myrdal proposed in his 1950s critique of the nationalism of democratic Western welfare states. In any case, even good answers to questions of national competitiveness and security fail to answer questions of democracy, citizenship, social equality, and the ecological preconditions of life. There is a risk that the reinforced emphasis on the competition-state and security-state aspects of the nation state will make it even more difficult to formulate such questions to effectively recognise that they are simultaneously local, national, European, and global.

#### Competition defines “us” through total war---the virtuous cycle of Darwinist competition eliminates morality.

Pauli Kettunen 97. Professor of Political History in the Social Science Faculty of University of Helsinki. "The society of virtuous circles." Models, modernity and the Myrdals (1997): 158-159. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Pauli-Kettunen/publication/310465167\_myrdal97/data/582ee82d08aef19cb815235b/myrdal97.doc

There was, thus, a possibility of virtuous circle between national integration and welfare, and international integration and balance. Here, however, Myrdal's "created harmony" was clearly a criterion of an immanent critique of the Welfare State. Applying my account of the Nordic notion of society, I would interpret his position in the following way. On the national level planning made efficiency, solidarity and democracy become values and properties of society and 'us'. These values of national society and national 'us' each had an international dimension. Democracy meant international manifestation of the democratic model of society; solidarity was widened to international solidarity; and efficiency meant international economic competitiveness. But there was a big difficulty: it was very obvious that 'us' defined through international competitiveness and 'us' defined through international solidarity were not identical. The actor of the virtuous circle of national and international integration could not be 'us' defined through international competitiveness but here 'us' had to be based upon "the international idealism of all people, which I believe is a reality", as Myrdal wrote in 1960 (Myrdal 1960, 214).

This past vision of future may be contrasted with the recent description of present by Riccardo Petrella, a leading figure in the adminstration of social reseach in the European Union. The year is 1995. According to Petrella economic competitiveness

has become the prime objective bit just of enterprises but also of the State and of society as a whole. ... The 'gospel of competition', like all ideologies, boils down to a few simple ideas. We are engaged willy nilly - so the industrialists, economists, political leaders and academics tell us - in a ruthless technological, industrial and economic war encompassing the entire planet. The aim is to survive, and survival hinges on being competitive. Otherwise there is no short- and long-term salvation, no growth, no economic and social welfare. The chief role of State, local authorities and trades unions is to provide the most suitable environment for enterprises to be, become or stay competitive in the world economic war. (Petrella 1995, 11-12)

Petrella's sarcastic description of Darwinist competition for survival is a description of a way in which national society is reproduced in the globalized economy after the liberation of finance markets and after the disappearance of the Cold War confrontation and moral competition between different types of society. It is important to note that in his criticism of the enthusiastic construction of national competition strategies, Petrella is not in the first place talking about "bad" strategies of social dumping and the lowering of social costs. Rather, he is talking about "good" value-added strategies which are based on process and product innovation, education and training, increased competence, stronger attention to "human capital" by means of "human resource management", etc.

Petrella warns about breaking up of the social contract. But he is not talking about the same thing as Touraine who writes that we "no longer belong to a society, a social class or a nation to the extent that our lives are in part determined by the world market, and in part confined to a world of personal life, interpersonal relations and cultural traditions" (Touraine 1994, 373). Neither is Petrella talking about the dissolution of society in the sense of Lash and Urry who point to vanishing borders and growing reflexivity of actors in the process of globalization. On the contrary, Petrella identifies a very national and very influential way of reacting and contributing to globalization, in which competition of nations, firms and individuals is the main expression of "reflexive modernization" (cf. Beck, Giddens & Lash 1994).

There are, no doubt, different views about the role of nation-state and national society in globalizing capitalism. In this book The Work of Nations. Preparing ourselves for 21st century capitalism (1991) Robert B. Reich, the Secretary of Labor in the Clinton administration, argues for the thesis that there are no more national economies, there is only a global economy. But according to Reich, this very condition can liberate the national society of the imperatives of international economic competition. The national society could survive and even strengthen as a basis of social solidarity and as a basis of policies which contribute to the progress of global economy (Reich 1991, 301-315).

National society without national economy - without stopping to discuss the probability of this vision we may see that it is different from Myrdal's national and international "created harmony", despite the "international idealism" common to Myrdal and Reich.

However, the vision of another Harvard economist, Michael E. Porter, seems to offer more influential way of giving both role and meaning to national society. His book The Competitive Advantage of the Nations (1990) is an argument for a central role of nation as "home base" for globally operating and globally competitive enterprises. Crucial competitive advantages are created in national contexts, especially those that are based on innovation and competence. This argument attracts policy-makers and -planners. Even the defence of the Nordic institutions of industrial relations may get new legitimation as it is taught that high standards of working life and participation of employees are sources of innovation and thus competitiveness. The way is open to positive value-added competition strategies. In their connection many good things can be included in the argumentation for economic competitiveness. You can argue for moral, ecological, or aesthetic values without being obliged to use moral, ecological, or aesthetic arguments; you just prove that they promote economic competitiveness.

Obviously, this is a kind of virtuous circle. And it is not so very different from the old virtuous circle of the Swedish Model or Myrdal's thought. It is important to note that the vulgarized Keynesian notion of the virtuous circle between increased production and increased consumption does not adequately catch the main economic concern of Myrdal and other Swedish Social Democrats. They had a remarkable supply-side interest already in the 1930s, expressed, for example, in the plan of the Myrdals for the raising of the quality of human material in Sweden (cf. Esping-Andersen 1992, 45). A major concern was to release the creative resources of the people. This was a precondition for social equality and welfare, but still more, promoting social equality was seen as the means by which these human resources would be released.

Now, there is here a crucial difference between the old and new virtuous circles. Social equality and social solidarity have been dropped outside the virtuous circle in the project for competitive innovation. It is not through more equality that people are supposed to become more innovative and more competitive. And in the Nordic countries we carry a historical burden to which the Myrdals for their part contributed: all good things have to form a virtuous circle and only such things are good that can be placed in the virtuous circle of society.

#### “We” are in a moment of crisis that requires new terms of debate---the current order cannot address violence until the very concepts of “the public” is rewritten.

Jay Blumler and Stephen Coleman 21. Jay Blumler is Emeritus Professor of Public Communication at the University of Leeds and Emeritus Professor of Journalism at the University of Maryland. Stephen Coleman (corresponding author) is Professor of Political Communication at the University of Leeds. “After the Crisis, A “New Normal” for Democratic Citizenship?” Javnost - The Public, 28:1, 3-19, DOI: 10.1080/13183222.2021.1883884

The lesson we draw from these studies is that crises do not generate changes in norms and practices deterministically through some sort of metaphysical shock wave. Normative and practical changes are consequences of altered perceptions of meaning. Crises throw social meaning into disarray, fracturing seemingly settled accounts of who “we” are; whose social contributions are most important; how to speak about causes and effects; feasible scales of social coordination; what can and cannot be tolerated; and how to demonstrate accountability. In crises, contestations of meaning become more explicit. Claims that certain perspectives are beyond the pale have less clout. Ideas that had an incipient, but marginal presence in pre-crisis thinking might begin to be taken seriously. A mixture of nervous conjecture and confident extemporisation inflect the public conversation, undermining abiding certainties.

Faced with a historically exceptional combination of global pandemic and economic depression, some citizens and politicians reach for a new language of civic reflection. This is because any hope of tackling the unprecedented debt pressures, market failures, infrastructural collapse, population immobility, intensifying inequalities and collective trauma generated by the crisis will not only call for imaginative, coordinated and massively resourced policy responses, but a new way of talking about policy that is not weighed down by obsolete categories. In short, much depends upon whether people can find a common frame of reflection that will enable them to think, speak and act upon what binds them together as well as what divides them.

Politics arises when people disagree, and now that there are more and bigger problems than ever to disagree about it is vitally important to find ways of arguing that do not exacerbate uncertainty or intolerance. In any political disagreement there are two matters at stake: firstly, the nature of the dispute; secondly, the competing options for action. The second cannot be realised unless there is some clarity surrounding the first. The political theorist, William Connolly (1993, 2) suggests that the distinction between these tasks can be compared to the conventionally agreed meanings set out for juries before they deliberate on a legal case:

The jury examines the evidence and reaches a verdict but prior to its deliberations, the judge, acting as the official interpreter of the law, charges the jury with a set of responsibilities, establishes what can be considered as evidence, and specifies what constitutes a punishable offense … In charging the jury and in regulating the presentation of evidence to it, the judge, we might say, specifies the terms within which the jury considers evidence and reaches a verdict.

Of course, democratic public debate does not take place in a courtroom in which the rules of discourse can be laid down by an authoritative judge. The contestability of the terms of political discourse by the people themselves is a fundamental precondition of democracy. People must not only be able to have their say, but to determine what they are talking about; what matters and what things mean. This entails a capacity to argue about the very norms that underpin policy decisions and to communicate across differences, acknowledging normative disagreements as necessary features of political communication. It is to these matters of normative contestation that we refer when we suggest that “the new normal” depends upon finding a refreshed language of democratic citizenship. What form might this discursive reconfiguration take? How might it be incorporated into an emerging vernacular of civic discourse?

Re-Thinking the Space, Mediation and Contestation of Citizenship

Citizenship involves the performance of norms and practices through which people are bound to strangers within communities of co-existence. The traditional liberal conception of citizenship sees it as a relationship between individuals and the state entailing the exercise of duties and rights. Citizenship in this sense is a status bestowed on those who are full members of a polity. Anyone who possesses this status is equal, having all the rights and duties that come with legally sanctioned legitimacy. No universal principle determines what those rights and duties shall be, but over time societies tend to create images of the ideal citizen and direct individuals to aspire to them (Marshall 1964).

In contrast to this legalistic notion of citizenship, there is a broader, less state-bound characterisation which sees it as comprising a repertoire of practices that people inherit and devise in order to co-exist interdependently with others. In this broader sense, to act as a citizen is to engage in public situations of various kinds with people one might not know and who might not share one’s interests, tastes, values, or even language. Sometimes civic interactions will involve relations with governments, authorities, or employers. At other times they will relate to quotidian ways of living amongst neighbours and strangers. Performances of citizenship are both framed institutionally, conforming to conventional notions of political and civic participation (voting, joining parties and campaigns, following the news) and improvised from below, often transcending or resisting established civic scripts. Through such extemporised forms of social practice, citizens create what Arendt (1958, 198) refers to as “spaces of appearance”: “the space where I appear to others as others appear to me, where men (sic) exist not merely like other living or inanimate things, but make their appearance explicitly.”

The crisis induced by the pandemic raises fundamental questions about how citizens are to “make their appearance explicitly.” Most of the decisions and regulations responding to the crisis have been framed by political elites and legitimised by appeals to expert wisdom. Public involvement in shaping or making such decisions has been extremely limited, raising questions about the role of democratic publics in responding to critical issues that affect them. Moves to democratise crisis response are bound to consider fundamental questions about who constitutes “the public” (given the need to respond to social challenges that transcend political borders); how civic discourse is mediated (given the need to generate global narratives, conversations and concerted actions in the face of common threats) and how political differences can be both recognised and negotiated (given the urgent need for pluralistic publics to work through complex problems). It is to these questions that we now turn.

Constituting the Public Domain

The global pandemic has brought into sharp focus the spatial framing of political problems within national boundaries. Since the middle of the seventeenth century, politics has been conceived as “taking place” within national units characterised by territorial borders, sovereign authority, civically attached populations and bounded economic interests. The emergence of nation-states as a natural scale of political action and analysis is the defining feature of the Westphalian order in which to govern is to protect and enhance national state interests; to be a citizen is to belong to a nation state, thereby bound by specific geo-political responsibilities and rights; and to speak of democracy in an empirically meaningful sense is to refer to a mode of legitimacy operating at the nation-state level. The Westphalian view of political place established a firm distinction between domestic and foreign domains; inside and outside; the scope of national control and extraneous precariousness.

The robustness of these conceptual categories of inter-national social order have been called into question by the speed and density of global economic and cultural interconnections that have become increasingly manifest since the late twentieth century. The conception of the globally dominant capitalist market as a “world system” was elaborated in the mid-1970s by Immanuel Wallerstein (1974, 390) who urged social scientists to abandon the reification of the nation-state as the primary unit of politico-economic analysis. He argued that capitalism could only operate as a world economy “with a single division of labour and multiple cultural systems.” In short, states might be distinguished by cultural characteristics and domestic political projects, but they cannot escape their enmeshment in a global system of interdependent economic relations. Some theorists have celebrated globalisation as a modernising force, while others have warned against its homogenising flattening of cultures. Rejecting the simplistic notion of globalisation as “a single society and culture occupying the planet” (Waters 1995), more nuanced theorists have observed that the contemporary world is characterised by a marked tension between the specificity of place and the overriding dynamics of a global system. The latter frequently overrides the particularities of national statehood, economy and culture, while state actors do what they can to assert their independence. It makes sense to think of there being “multiple, overlapping, and sometimes contradictory globalisms” (Tsing 2000, 342), with states reshaping their territorial claims “on to both sub- and supra-national geographical scales” (Brenner 1999, 65). Such framing and reframing of political space depend as much upon symbolic mediation as upon the rules, treaties and logics of transnational institutions. In short, globalisation entails an ongoing struggle to tell people where and to what they belong.

The Covid-19 health crisis is a primary example of this battle to frame a global event. Most people acknowledge that the pandemic is truly global, albeit disparately pernicious in different parts of the world, and at different times. In relation to the urgent need for global coordination to find a vaccine, the insular ambitions of nations or regions seem manifestly petty and irrelevant. However, that has not stopped nationalist leaders from playing blame games in which they ascribe the origin of the virus to nefarious foreign states, or from making boastful claims that their public health strategy is “world-beating” rather than simply functional. Rarely has the disconnect between bombastic national rhetoric and empirical global reality seemed more conspicuous.

Given that the most pressing and intractable contemporary challenges can only be addressed through global coordination, the challenge of finding effective ways of communicating and acting beyond national silos seems more urgent than ever. From the spread of viruses to regulation of the environment, and from the direction of migration flows to the looming catastrophe of climate change, nation-states appear to be Canute-like before the irresistible waves of globalism. Left to themselves, nations squabble about who should take responsibility, constantly deferring meaningful action until others have made a move.

The inescapably global nature of the pandemic has shown the futility and risk of such an approach, casting doubt upon the pursuit of national solutions and pointing towards the urgency of appeals to transnational public agency. Faced with globally diffuse problems of viral contagion, climate change and market instability, the civic case for stretching the use and meaning of the term “we, the public” becomes compelling. This important shift in collective self-consciousness entails the adoption of what Nancy Fraser (2007, 21) refers to as “the all-affected principle”:

Today, … the idea that citizenship can serve as a proxy for affectedness is no longer plausible. Under current conditions, one’s conditions of living do not depend wholly on the internal constitution of the political community of which one is a citizen. Although the latter remains undeniably relevant, its effects are mediated by other structures, both extra and non-territorial, whose impact is at least as significant … In general, globalization is driving a widening wedge between affectedness and political membership. As those two notions increasingly diverge, the effect is to reveal the former as an inadequate surrogate for the latter.

It follows from Fraser’s analysis that “what turns a collection of people into fellow members of a public is not shared citizenship, but their co-imbrication in a common set of structures and/or institutions that affect their lives” (ibid, 22). The logic of the all-affected principle rejects the notion that only national publics can confer democratic legitimacy, as the latter depends upon registering the voices of all those who are potentially affected by a problem, notwithstanding their national labels. This amounts to a post-Westphalian conception of citizenship in which, rather than being fragmented by artificial political divisions, the public is characterised by its common vulnerabilities, experiences and capacities. Members of post-Westphalian publics will continue to disagree with one another, of course, but the public sphere within which such political disagreement takes place will correspond to the dimensions of the issues at stake.

To be clear, it is only through the emergence of a cosmopolitan public domain in which solidarities are rooted in common affectedness rather than national-legal identities that global challenges such as the pandemic and economic depression, as well as climate change and other environmental threats, can be tackled democratically. This does not amount to a utopian call for citizens to adopt an abstractly cosmopolitan stance. Already competing with discourses of nationalism and populism in contemporary societies are many millions of voices across the world who view social problems from the perspective of a universal humanity sharing a common home. Such people are more inclined “to take risks by virtue of encountering the ‘other’” and to possess “some ability to reflect upon and judge aesthetically between different natures, places and societies” (Szerszynskiand and Urry 2002, 470). By understanding that “[g]lobalisation has brought large swathes of the world’s population closer together” in overlapping communities of fate (Held 2003, 478), many contemporary campaigners for social justice frame their arguments in terms of a language of cosmopolitan sensibility. These include movements opposing the structural inequalities of transnational economic power (such as Occupy Wall Street), ecological depredation (the School Strike for Climate Change), institutional sexism (MeToo) and racism (Black Lives Matter). The effectiveness of these campaigns in bringing injustices to global attention does not entail abandoning national institutions and populations as if they no longer matter, but framing messages to affected citizens within a cosmopolitan context that celebrates openness to global heterogeneity, pluralism and nuance.

As the pandemic highlights the limitations of the Westphalian conception of “normal” by forcing people from across the world to face up to their interdependence, both in terms of the transnational porosity of contagion and the resources needed to contain it, it calls attention to the aptness of a “new normal” in which shared social problems are addressed on a new scale. This adjustment of scale calls into being new conceptions of the public, defined increasingly in terms of shared affectedness.

Given that the most urgent crisis facing the world in the aftermath of the pandemic will be the threat of global catastrophe caused by climate change, the world is increasingly dependent upon the practical effectiveness of calls to action that are couched in a language of citizenship that transcends state borders and prioritises shared affectedness. The challenge of co-ordinating moral and political responses with a view to enhancing the public’s global agency is now a prerequisite for even modest success of efforts to save the planet from systemically wrought depredation. Could the public that has begun to develop a consciousness of its collective global vulnerability during the pandemic act upon such awareness beyond the current crisis?

#### Cosmopolitization is ontological---the nation-state makes survival impossible, engaging in double exclusion: excluding the excluded from consideration.

Ulrich Beck 14. Institute of Sociology, Munich, Germany. “We Do Not Live in an Age of Cosmopolitanism but in an Age of Cosmopolitization: The ‘Global Other’ is in Our Midst.” https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7124081/

Nation

But the same is true for the macro level as well. Like climate change, most of the main impetuses for social and economic transformations in the new century do not differentially or exclusively apply to certain limited groups of nations. Consider the following: global free trade and financialization, corporate deterritorialization and transnationalized production, globalized policy consulting and formulation (coerced by the International Monetary Fund, etc.), and, last but not least, globally financed and managed regional wars (Chang 2010b: 444–445).

There are no permanent systematic hierarchies, sequences or selectivities by which different groups of nations—whether at different levels of development, in different regions or of different ethnicities and religions—are exposed to these new civilizational forces in mutually exclusive ways. Wanted or not, they are every nation’s and every person’s concern because they are structurally enmeshed with the new civilization process which I call ‘(reflexive) cosmopolitization’; and the civilizational condition thereby shared across the globe is ‘(reflexive or) second modernity’.

Cooperate or Fail!

Recent world history seems to dictate that surviving, let alone benefiting from, these new civilizational forces requires every nation to actively internalize them and one another. Again: the global other is in our midst!

Isolationist efforts—whether spoken of in terms of trade protectionism, religious fundamentalism, national fundamentalism, media and internet control or whatever else—are readily subjected to international moral condemnations (and, to some extent, ineffective). In fact, accepting or refusing these forces remains beyond willful political or social choices because they are globally reflexive—that is, compulsively occurring through the cosmopolitan imperative: cooperate or fail!

There is an increasing unease, nourished not least by the hesitant responses to the global financial crisis, the European currency crisis, and the poor results of the last global climate conference at Copenhagen in 2009, that these institutions are proving unable to address the challenges they were created to meet. Similar developments can be observed at the national level, regarding, for example, democratic institutions, welfare systems, families, and so forth. Can the World Bank solve the global problem of poverty? Can the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) solve a global food crisis? Can the World Trade Organization effectively regulate global trade? It seems as if these institutions do not constitute a sufficient basis for managing or controlling the global risks and crises created by the global victory of industrial capitalism.

Reflexivity and Normativity4

The age of cosmopolitization finally means that the great questions of life have to be addressed and understood—in opposition to the main trends in sociology and art, albeit from a novel point of view: in the distant other who is also very close we recognize ourselves.

Every epoch has its own epistemological and moral Sisyphus-questions: what is a ‘good life’? What is a ‘good government’? What goes towards making a ‘good society’, a ‘good family’ (a ‘good woman’, a ‘good man’, a ‘good child’, etc.)? All social and moral orders hitherto had, implicitly at least, answers befitting their own age or aspiring to universal validity. Reflexive cosmopolitization casts doubt on these claims in two ways: on the one hand, the regime of the Either/Or had traditionally set territorial limits to the contradictions of particular universalist claims to a ‘good life’, a ‘good society’, and a ‘good religion’ and in so doing, defused them. In the age of cosmopolitization, this world of clear distinctions and classifications now disappears. It follows that today in the everyday encounters between world religions the claims to universal validity of the two major cultures of Europe—the culture of Christianity and the culture of secular modernity—no longer hold water. The same may be said of the particularist universalist claims of other religions, such as Islamist universalism (‘Ummah’). Thus it is not just the case that religious differences become sources of conflict; over and above that, in the cosmopolitan constellation, we are witnessing the implosion of contextually defined universalisms and national and ethical certitudes along with them. Hence the outburst of neo-nationalism and the emergence of a democratic racism in the midst of societies everywhere.

On the other hand, a second consequence of this change is that we are witnessing the opening of a horizon in which new, existential Sisyphus questions become visible for which traditional social and political systems hold no answers. These questions concern the possibility of what Joshua J. Yates (2009) calls ‘the good world’, as the solution to a civilization at risk of self-destruction. They ask whether a modernity without limits (unlimited freedom, unlimited capitalism, unlimited research into human genetics, reproductive medicine, nanotechnology, etc.) needs ‘reflexive taboos’ (Beck/Sznaider 2011) to protect its most sacred values from itself. Is this the explanation for the absolutely unquenchable thirst for limits that is convulsing the global community?

This is exactly what the transformative dynamics of the second, cosmopolitan modernity is about! Isn’t there a gulf of centuries between the threats, opportunities and conflict dynamics of border-transcending, radicalized modernization in the twenty-first century and the ideas, institutions and structures of industrial capitalism and national state authority rooted in the nineteenth century?

It has become a commonplace that national institutions alone are unable to cope with the challenges of regulating global capitalism and responding to new global risks (Beck 1999, 2009). It is no less obvious that there is no global state or international organization capable of regulating global capital and risk in a way comparable to the role played by the European welfare national state in first modernity. In my Munich research centre (Institute for the Study of Reflexive Modernization), Edgar Grande in particular is concentrating on ‘risk regime’. There are platforms of cosmopolitan cooperation between representatives of transnational capital, national governments, global civil society groups and EU experts—trying to find answers to all kind of risk problems and conflicts which can later be implemented in national spaces. And, of course, regional powers become important: Cosmopolitan Europe (and maybe in the future a Cosmopolitan Asia, a Cosmopolitan South America, a Cosmopolitan Africa as well).

Re-mapping Social Inequality Beyond Methodological Nationalism

Studying the cosmopolitization of social inequality—and, indeed, across the globe inequalities seem to have increased—it is less clear that social class is the principal unit of analysis and investigation. I rather provocatively developed the argument that ‘social class’ is too soft a category to study social inequalities in the twenty-first century.

I developed three points here: first, the world of second modernity is a world of unbelievable contradictions and contrasts. There are ‘super modern castles’ or citadels constructed next to scenes of Apocalypse Now (as with the now destroyed World Trade Center in New York with thousands of beggars living in the subway below). Class hardly captures such shimmering inequality.

Second, the major movements of change have little to do with class, even that responsible for the most stunning transformation of the past three decades, such as the financial crisis of 2008, ‘9/11’ and the dramatic and unpredicted bringing down of the Soviet empire by various rights-based social networks.

Third, the national outlook on social inequality is inward orientated. It stops at the borders of the nation-state. Social inequalities may blossom and flourish on the other side of the national garden fence, which is, at best cause for moral outrage, but politically irrelevant.

A clear distinction must be made, therefore, between the reality of social inequality and the political problem of social inequality. National boundaries draw a sharp distinction between politically relevant and irrelevant inequality. Inequalities within national societies are enormously magnified in perception; at the same time inequalities between national societies are faded out. The ‘legitimation’ of global inequalities is based on an institutionalized ‘looking the other way’. The national gaze is ‘freed’ from looking at the misery of the world. It operates by way of a double exclusion: it excludes the excluded. And the social science of inequality, which equates inequality with nation-state inequality, is unreflectively party to that. It is indeed astonishing how firmly global inequalities are ‘legitimated’ on the basis of tacit agreement between nation-state government and nation-state sociology—a sociology programmed to work on a nation-state basis and claiming to be value-free!

My point is that while the performance principle legitimates national inequality, the nation-state principle legitimates global inequality (in another form). How? The inequalities between countries, regions and states are accounted politically incomparable. In a perspective bounded by the nation-state, politically relevant comparisons can only be played out within the nation-state, never between states. Such comparisons, which make inequality politically explosive, assume national norms of equality.

Paradox: even de-creasing global inequalities and in-creasing global norms of equality make global inequalities socially and politically explosive. Why? Because nation-state borders lose their function to legitimate global inequalities.

Yet that is precisely what the national gaze fades out: the more norms of equality spread worldwide, the more global inequality is stripped of the legitimation basis of institutionalized looking away. The wealthy democracies carry the banner of human rights to the furthest corners of the earth, without noticing that the national border defences, with which they want to repel the streams of migrants, thereby lose their legitimation. Many migrants take seriously the proclaimed human right of equality of mobility and encounter countries and states which—not least under the impact of increasing internal inequalities—want the norm of equality to stop short at their fortified borders. Put in other words, that means: the conception of social class, based on principles of nationality and statehood, misleads analysis. Most theorists of class, including Bourdieu (1984), who thought so extensively about globalization in his final years, identify class society with the nation-state. The same is true of Wallerstein (1974/1980/1989), Goldthorpe (2002) and, incidentally, also of my individualization thesis.

World Risk Society and Its Political Dynamics

Why is the concept of ‘(world) risk society’ so important in order to understand the social and political dynamics and transformations at the beginning of the twenty-first century? (Beck 2009). It is the accumulation of risks—ecological, financial, military, terrorist, biochemical and informational—that has an overwhelming presence in our world today. To the extent that risk is experienced as omnipresent, there are only three possible reactions: denial, apathy and transformation. The first is largely inscribed in modern culture, but ignores the political risk of denial; the second gives way to a nihilistic strain in postmodernism; the third marks the issue the theory on world risk society raises: how does the anticipation of a multiplicity of man-made futures and its risky consequences affect and transform the perceptions, living conditions and institutions of modern societies?

#### Double exclusion predetermines the parameters of violence we can conceptualize---attempts to filter out the 1AC are the ontological-cosmological commitments that denigrate and minimize life expression.

Tamara Trownsell et al. 19. Tamara Trownsell, Associate Professor of IR @ Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Ecuador. AND Amaya Querejazu, Associate Professor of IR and Latin American Studies at Universidad de Antioquia, Colombia. AND Giorgio Shani, Chair of the Department of Politics and IR @ International Christian University. AND Navnita Chadha Behera, Visiting Fulbright Fellow at George Washington University and Professor of IR @ the University of Delhi. AND Jarrad Reddekop, Associate Fellow at the Centre for Studies in Religion and Society @ the University of Victoria. AND Arlene Tickner, professor of IR @ the Universidad del Rosario, Colombia. “Recrafting International Relations through Relationality.” https://www.e-ir.info/2019/01/08/recrafting-international-relations-through-relationality/

How we relate to others should be a central concern of the field of International Relations. However, independent political communities—states—and their interrelations have historically been the focus of the discipline of International Relations (IR), thus limiting the forms of interaction that potentially constitute the field.[1] Postpositivist accounts have repeatedly indicated the disjuncture between the conceptual constructs that IR scholars use to make sense of the world historically and the way people practice their lives, which in the end is the substance of global politics. Many critical projects including Global IR have challenged the research produced through atomistic understandings of the world, and attempts have been made to integrate other ways of knowing into the discipline (Acharya 2014, Jackson and Nexon 1999, Tickner and Wæver 2009). While the ‘critical turn’ has made IR a more plural discipline by opening space for examining different types of relations, they have still been founded on modern, western ‘ontological’ assumptions about existence that have undercut their ability to reap the full benefits of other more robustly relational ways of existing (Blaney and Tickner 2017, Shani 2008, Trownsell 2013). Because the kind of plurality practised has not effectively dealt with distinctly relational ways of living and forms of knowing in their own terms, the call that we are making here is not just about adding other perspectives to the IR cauldron. We are aspiring for a deep plurality, in which IR scholars learn to effectively engage with difference at the ontological, methodological and practical levels.

Since the issue at hand is about ontological-cosmological commitments, we proffer our particular understandings of these terms. By ontology, we mean those basic assumptions about the nature of existence that are operative within any given tradition of living and thinking. In this sense ontology is closely linked to the cosmological in that they both reflect how we conceptualize our relationship with the cosmos and our place in it (Shani 2017). They are distinct in that cosmology refers more to origin stories and to cultural, spiritual and religious practices while ontology expresses the assumptions about the primordial condition of existence that provides the underlying logic of cosmological accounts and as such of all the other cultural fruits that emerge from them. Here we focus on ontology, because it helps draw attention to and provincialize many of the fundamental assumptions made in the dominant IR tradition, many of which have become invisible or merely commonsensical by being consonant with prevalent shared meaning systems and through longstanding and conventional use.

The general inability both in the field and discipline of international relations to recognize when and how one and others are engaging existence from very distinct ontological points of departure has had a serious impact in terms of both politics and knowledge production. Promoted through globally replicated institutions including academia, media, churches, etc., conceptualizing and practicing existence based on separation has become so naturalized that other more relational forms of being have been silenced and excluded. Conflict over what counts as real arises since those applying the predominant assumptions cannot even fathom that these other ways of being can be possible, legitimate or valid. As such living in one’s own or a group’s terms becomes a struggle when they are not aligned with the more predominant logic.

Several consequences of being blind to these relational ways of living and being manifest themselves politically. First these life expressions are often “othered” and “minimized” by treating them as myths (Law 2015), legends, superstitions, or stories about how people communicate with other beings. Denigration also becomes evident when examining public policies that do not even articulate, let alone protect, these relational ways of life. Among humans, groups abound that have not been deemed worthy of civil rights protections in the process of statebuilding for not engaging the world in sufficiently “civilized” manners (Sawyer 2004). Others have been the targets of state-led violence through national forced sterilization or “population control” initiatives (Carpio 2004, Pegoraro 2015). Beyond the human, these excluded groups have clamored to protect other beings that do not translate easily into traditional legal frameworks. For example, while indigenous groups were able to get the rights of nature officially acknowledged in Ecuador’s 2008 constitution, an effective implementation of these rights has yet to be seen. Efforts to maintain a healthy relationship with the beings of land, water, air, plants and animals often come into direct conflict with “national interests,” international treaties, foreign direct investment and forms of international cooperation, as can be clearly seen in last year’s indigenous struggles at Standing Rock in the United States. In the end, the ontological nature of these clashes has been clearly echoed in the zapatistas’ claims to a world of many worlds when stating, “We are another resistance, we are another reality.”[2]

In addition to the important political implications in the field of international relations, the discipline itself has yet to consider seriously relational ways of knowing and being. Because the problematics typical of IR and the tools generated to deal with them have been identified and named through the same predominant set of existential assumptions, the conceptual capacity of the discipline to grasp and respond to these ways of knowing is limited. In fact the predominant understanding of ontology within the discipline of IR has been referred to as “scientific ontology” (Patomäki and Wight 2000, Jackson 2011). Here scholars fight over what exists in the world without a prior discussion as to how it is ontologically that we arrive at a place where we insist on the existential autonomy of categories in the first place. This means that we keep studying these cosmologies through ontologically incommensurate filters (not based on similar existential assumptions) thinking that in this way we will still be able to understand them and then use the knowledge generated through reduced filters to find effective strategies for engagement. Yet our ontological parochialism still translates into epistemic violence by not being able to hear, understand, engage their world in their own ontological terms. Simultaneously we continue to generate a skewed picture of the kinds of knowing and being practiced in distinct parts of the world and subsequently of world politics. Consequently the resulting “intelligibility gap” still reinforces certain ways of being and knowing in the world as more legitimate or acceptable than others, thus reinforcing the source of cosmological insecurity for those falling outside these parameters.

#### The only just response is post-Westphalian---the “who” of justice determines what we consider crisis and response. Meta-injustice through frame setting determines who has the right to have rights.

Nancy Fraser 05. Henry A. and Louise Loeb Professor of Political and Social Science and professor of philosophy at The New School. “Reframing Justice in a Globalizing World, NLR 36, November–December 2005.” New Left Review. https://newleftreview-org.proxy.library.emory.edu/issues/ii36/articles/nancy-fraser-reframing-justice-in-a-globalizing-world

Globalization is changing the way we argue about justice.footnote1 Not so long ago, in the heyday of social democracy, disputes about justice presumed what I shall call a ‘Keynesian-Westphalian frame’. Typically played out within modern territorial states, arguments about justice were assumed to concern relations among fellow citizens, to be subject to debate within national publics, and to contemplate redress by national states. This was true for each of two major families of justice claims—claims for socioeconomic redistribution and claims for legal or cultural recognition. At a time when the Bretton Woods system facilitated Keynesian economic steering at the national level, claims for redistribution usually focused on economic inequities within territorial states. Appealing to national public opinion for a fair share of the national pie, claimants sought intervention by national states in national economies. Likewise, in an era still gripped by a Westphalian political imaginary, which sharply distinguished ‘domestic’ from ‘international’ space, claims for recognition generally concerned internal status hierarchies. Appealing to the national conscience for an end to nationally institutionalized disrespect, claimants pressed national governments to outlaw discrimination and accommodate differences among citizens. In both cases, the Keynesian-Westphalian frame was taken for granted. Whether the matter concerned redistribution or recognition, class differentials or status hierarchies, it went without saying that the unit within which justice applied was the modern territorial state.footnote2

To be sure, there were always exceptions. Occasionally, famines and genocides galvanized public opinion across borders. And some cosmopolitans and anti-imperialists sought to promulgate globalist views.footnote3 But these were exceptions that proved the rule. Relegated to the sphere of ‘the international’, they were subsumed within a problematic that was focused primarily on matters of security, as opposed to justice. The effect was to reinforce, rather than to challenge, the Keynesian-Westphalian frame. That framing of disputes about justice generally prevailed by default from the end of the Second World War to the 1970s.

Although it went unnoticed at the time, this framework lent a distinctive shape to arguments about social justice. Taking for granted the modern territorial state as the appropriate unit, and its citizens as the pertinent subjects, such arguments turned on what precisely those citizens owed one another. In the eyes of some, it sufficed that citizens be formally equal before the law; for others, equality of opportunity was also required; for still others, justice demanded that all citizens gain access to the resources and respect they needed in order to be able to participate on a par with others, as full members of the political community. The argument focused, in other words, on exactly what should count as a just ordering of social relations within a society. Engrossed in disputing the ‘what’ of justice, the contestants apparently felt no necessity to dispute the ‘who’. With the Keynesian-Westphalian frame securely in place, it went without saying that the ‘who’ was the national citizenry.

Today, however, this framework is losing its aura of self-evidence. Thanks to heightened awareness of globalization, and to post-Cold War geopolitical instabilities, many observe that the social processes shaping their lives routinely overflow territorial borders. They note, for example, that decisions taken in one territorial state often have an impact on the lives of those outside it, as do the actions of transnational corporations, international currency speculators, and large institutional investors. Many also note the growing salience of supranational and international organizations, both governmental and non-governmental, and of transnational public opinion, which flows with supreme disregard for borders through global mass media and cybertechnology. The result is a new sense of vulnerability to transnational forces. Faced with global warming, the spread of aids, international terrorism and superpower unilateralism, many believe that their chances for living good lives depend at least as much on processes that trespass the borders of territorial states as on those contained within them.

Under these conditions, the Keynesian-Westphalian frame no longer goes without saying. For many, it has ceased to be axiomatic that the modern territorial state is the appropriate unit for thinking about issues of justice, and that the citizens of such states are the pertinent subjects of reference. The effect is to destabilize the previous structure of political claims-making—and therefore to change the way we argue about social justice.

This is true for both major families of justice claims. In today’s world, claims for redistribution increasingly eschew the assumption of national economies. Faced with transnationalized production, the outsourcing of jobs, and the associated pressures of the ‘race to the bottom’, once nationally focused labour unions look increasingly for allies abroad. Inspired by the Zapatistas, meanwhile, impoverished peasants and indigenous peoples link their struggles against despotic local and national authorities to critiques of transnational corporate predation and global neoliberalism. Finally, wto protestors directly target the new governance structures of the global economy, which have vastly strengthened the ability of large corporations and investors to escape the regulatory and taxation powers of territorial states.

In the same way, movements struggling for recognition increasingly look beyond the territorial state. Under the umbrella slogan ‘women’s rights are human rights’, for example, feminists throughout the world are linking struggles against local patriarchal practices to campaigns to reform international law. Meanwhile, religious and ethnic minorities, who face discrimination within territorial states, are reconstituting themselves as diasporas and building transnational publics from which to mobilize international opinion. Finally, transnational coalitions of human-rights activists are seeking to build new cosmopolitan institutions, such as the International Criminal Court, which can punish state violations of human dignity.

In such cases, disputes about justice are exploding the Keynesian-Westphalian frame. No longer addressed exclusively to national states or debated exclusively by national publics, claimants no longer focus solely on relations among fellow citizens. Thus, the grammar of argument has altered. Whether the issue is distribution or recognition, disputes that used to focus exclusively on the question of what is owed as a matter of justice to community members now turn quickly into disputes about who should count as a member and which is the relevant community. Not just the ‘what’ but also the ‘who’ is up for grabs.

Today, in other words, arguments about justice assume a double guise. On the one hand, they concern first-order questions of substance, just as before. How much economic inequality does justice permit, how much redistribution is required, and according to which principle of distributive justice? What constitutes equal respect, which kinds of differences merit public recognition, and by which means? But above and beyond such first-order questions, arguments about justice today also concern second-order, meta-level questions. What is the proper frame within which to consider first-order questions of justice? Who are the relevant subjects entitled to a just distribution or reciprocal recognition in the given case? Thus, it is not only the substance of justice, but also the frame, which is in dispute. The result is a major challenge to our theories of social justice. Preoccupied largely with first-order issues of distribution and/or recognition, these theories have so far failed to develop conceptual resources for reflecting on the meta-issue of the frame. As things stand, therefore, it is by no means clear that they are capable of addressing the double character of problems of justice in a globalizing age.footnote4

In this essay, I shall propose a strategy for thinking about the problem of the frame. I shall argue, first, that theories of justice must become three-dimensional, incorporating the political dimension of representation alongside the economic dimension of distribution and the cultural dimension of recognition. I shall also argue that the political dimension of representation should itself be understood as encompassing three levels. The combined effect of these two arguments will be to make visible a third question, beyond those of the ‘what’ and the ‘who’, which I shall call the question of the ‘how’. That question, in turn, inaugurates a paradigm shift: what the Keynesian-Westphalian frame cast as the theory of social justice must now become a theory of post-Westphalian democratic justice.

Specificity of the political

Let me begin by explaining what I mean by justice in general and by its political dimension in particular. In my view, the most general meaning of justice is parity of participation. According to this radical-democratic interpretation of the principle of equal moral worth, justice requires social arrangements that permit all to participate as peers in social life. Overcoming injustice means dismantling institutionalized obstacles that prevent some people from participating on a par with others, as full partners in social interaction. Previously, I have analysed two distinct kinds of obstacles to participatory parity, which correspond to two distinct species of injustice. On the one hand, people can be impeded from full participation by economic structures that deny them the resources they need in order to interact with others as peers; in that case they suffer from distributive injustice or maldistribution. On the other hand, people can also be prevented from interacting on terms of parity by institutionalized hierarchies of cultural value that deny them the requisite standing; in that case they suffer from status inequality or misrecognition.footnote5 In the first case, the problem is the class structure of society, which corresponds to the economic dimension of justice. In the second case, the problem is the status order, which corresponds to its cultural dimension. In modern capitalist societies, the class structure and the status order do not neatly mirror each other, although they interact causally. Rather, each has some autonomy vis-à-vis the other. As a result, misrecognition cannot be reduced to a secondary effect of maldistribution, as some economistic theories of distributive justice appear to suppose. Nor, conversely, can maldistribution be reduced to an epiphenomenal expression of misrecognition, as some culturalist theories of recognition tend to assume. Thus, neither recognition theory nor distribution theory alone can provide an adequate understanding of justice for capitalist society. Only a two-dimensional theory, encompassing both distribution and recognition, can supply the necessary levels of social-theoretical complexity and moral-philosophical insight.footnote6

That, at least, is the view of justice I have defended in the past. And this two-dimensional understanding of justice still seems right to me as far as it goes. But I now believe that it does not go far enough. Distribution and recognition could appear to constitute the sole dimensions of justice only so long as the Keynesian-Westphalian frame was taken for granted. Once the question of the frame becomes subject to contestation, the effect is to make visible a third dimension of justice, which was neglected in my previous work—as well as in the work of many other philosophers.footnote7

The third dimension of justice is the political. Of course, distribution and recognition are themselves political in the sense of being contested and power-laden; and they have usually been seen as requiring adjudication by the state. But I mean political in a more specific, constitutive sense, which concerns the nature of the state’s jurisdiction and the decision rules by which it structures contestation. The political in this sense furnishes the stage on which struggles over distribution and recognition are played out. Establishing criteria of social belonging, and thus determining who counts as a member, the political dimension of justice specifies the reach of those other dimensions: it tells us who is included in, and who excluded from, the circle of those entitled to a just distribution and reciprocal recognition. Establishing decision rules, the political dimension likewise sets the procedures for staging and resolving contests in both the economic and the cultural dimensions: it tells us not only who can make claims for redistribution and recognition, but also how such claims are to be mooted and adjudicated.

Centred on issues of membership and procedure, the political dimension of justice is concerned chiefly with representation. At one level, which pertains to the boundary-setting aspect of the political, representation is a matter of social belonging. What is at issue here is inclusion in, or exclusion from, the community of those entitled to make justice claims on one another. At another level, which pertains to the decision-rule aspect, representation concerns the procedures that structure public processes of contestation. Here, what is at issue are the terms on which those included in the political community air their claims and adjudicate their disputes.footnote8 At both levels, the question can arise as to whether the relations of representation are just. One can ask: do the boundaries of the political community wrongly exclude some who are actually entitled to representation? Do the community’s decision rules accord equal voice in public deliberations and fair representation in public decision-making to all members? Such issues of representation are specifically political. Conceptually distinct from both economic and cultural questions, they cannot be reduced to the latter, although, as we shall see, they are inextricably interwoven with them.

To say that the political is a conceptually distinct dimension of justice, not reducible to the economic or the cultural, is also to say that it can give rise to a conceptually distinct species of injustice. Given the view of justice as participatory parity, this means that there can be distinctively political obstacles to parity, not reducible to maldistribution or misrecognition, although (again) interwoven with them. Such obstacles arise from the political constitution of society, as opposed to the class structure or status order. Grounded in a specifically political mode of social ordering, they can only be adequately grasped through a theory that conceptualizes representation, along with distribution and recognition, as one of three fundamental dimensions of justice.

Three levels of misrepresentation

If representation is the defining issue of the political, then the characteristic political injustice is misrepresentation. Misrepresentation occurs when political boundaries and/or decision rules function to deny some people, wrongly, the possibility of participating on a par with others in social interaction—including, but not only, in political arenas. Far from being reducible to maldistribution or misrecognition, misrepresentation can occur even in the absence of the latter injustices, although it is usually intertwined with them. At least two different levels of misrepresentation can be distinguished. Insofar as political decision rules wrongly deny some of the included the chance to participate fully, as peers, the injustice is what I call ordinary-political misrepresentation. Here, where the issue is intra-frame representation, we enter the familiar terrain of political science debates over the relative merits of alternative electoral systems. Do single-member-district, winner-take-all, first-past-the-post systems unjustly deny parity to numerical minorities? And if so, is proportional representation or cumulative voting the appropriate remedy? Likewise, do gender-blind rules, in conjunction with gender-based maldistribution and misrecognition, function to deny parity of political participation to women? And if so, are gender quotas an appropriate remedy? Such questions belong to the sphere of ordinary-political justice, which has usually been played out within the Keynesian-Westphalian frame.

Less obvious, perhaps, is a second level of misrepresentation, which concerns the boundary-setting aspect of the political. Here the injustice arises when the community’s boundaries are drawn in such a way as to wrongly exclude some people from the chance to participate at all in its authorized contests over justice. In such cases, misrepresentation takes a deeper form, which I shall call misframing. The deeper character of misframing is a function of the crucial importance of framing to every question of social justice. Far from being of marginal significance, frame-setting is among the most consequential of political decisions. Constituting both members and non-members in a single stroke, this decision effectively excludes the latter from the universe of those entitled to consideration within the community in matters of distribution, recognition, and ordinary-political representation. The result can be a serious injustice. When questions of justice are framed in a way that wrongly excludes some from consideration, the consequence is a special kind of meta-injustice, in which one is denied the chance to press first-order justice claims in a given political community. The injustice remains, moreover, even when those excluded from one political community are included as subjects of justice in another—as long as the effect of the political division is to put some relevant aspects of justice beyond their reach. Still more serious, of course, is the case in which one is excluded from membership in any political community. Akin to the loss of what Hannah Arendt called ‘the right to have rights’, that sort of misframing is a kind of ‘political death’.footnote9 Those who suffer it may become objects of charity or benevolence. But deprived of the possibility of authoring first-order claims, they become non-persons with respect to justice.

It is the misframing form of misrepresentation that globalization has recently begun to make visible. Earlier, in the heyday of the postwar welfare state, with the Keynesian-Westphalian frame securely in place, the principal concern in thinking about justice was distribution. Later, with the rise of the new social movements and multiculturalism, the centre of gravity shifted to recognition. In both cases, the modern territorial state was assumed by default. As a result, the political dimension of justice was relegated to the margins. Where it did emerge, it took the ordinary-political form of contests over the decision rules internal to the polity, whose boundaries were taken for granted. Thus, claims for gender quotas and multicultural rights sought to remove political obstacles to participatory parity for those who were already included in principle in the political community. Taking for granted the Keynesian-Westphalian frame, they did not call into question the assumption that the appropriate unit of justice was the territorial state.

Today, in contrast, globalization has put the question of the frame squarely on the political agenda. Increasingly subject to contestation, the Keynesian-Westphalian frame is now considered by many to be a major vehicle of injustice, as it partitions political space in ways that block many who are poor and despised from challenging the forces that oppress them. Channelling their claims into the domestic political spaces of relatively powerless, if not wholly failed, states, this frame insulates offshore powers from critique and control.footnote10 Among those shielded from the reach of justice are more powerful predator states and transnational private powers, including foreign investors and creditors, international currency speculators, and transnational corporations. Also protected are the governance structures of the global economy, which set exploitative terms of interaction and then exempt them from democratic control. Finally, the Keynesian-Westphalian frame is self-insulating; the architecture of the interstate system protects the very partitioning of political space that it institutionalizes, effectively excluding transnational democratic decision-making on issues of justice.

From this perspective, the Keynesian-Westphalian frame is a powerful instrument of injustice, which gerrymanders political space at the expense of the poor and despised. For those persons who are denied the chance to press transnational first-order claims, struggles against maldistribution and misrecognition cannot proceed, let alone succeed, unless they are joined with struggles against misframing. It is not surprising, therefore, that some consider misframing the defining injustice of a globalizing age. Under these conditions, the political dimension of justice is hard to ignore. Insofar as globalization is politicizing the question of the frame, it is also making visible an aspect of the grammar of justice that was often neglected in the previous period. It is now apparent that no claim for justice can avoid presupposing some notion of representation, implicit or explicit, insofar as none can avoid assuming a frame. Thus, representation is always already inherent in all claims for redistribution and recognition. The political dimension is implicit in, indeed required by, the grammar of the concept of justice. Thus, no redistribution or recognition without representation.footnote11

In general, then, an adequate theory of justice for our time must be three-dimensional. Encompassing not only redistribution and recognition, but also representation, it must allow us to grasp the question of the frame as a question of justice. Incorporating the economic, cultural and political dimensions, it must enable us to identify injustices of misframing and to evaluate possible remedies. Above all, it must permit us to pose, and to answer, the key political question of our age: how can we integrate struggles against maldistribution, misrecognition and misrepresentation within a post-Westphalian frame?

#### Our contestation of the “who” of politics is open cosmopolitanism. Think transnational, crisscrossed networks of anti-nationalist, open public spheres that reimagine just, desirable futures---bottom up, agile movements can address global crisis by resisting hegemonic lifeworlds of competition.

Giuseppe Caruso 17. “Open Cosmopolitanism and the World Social Forum: Global Resistance, Emancipation, and the Activists’ Vision of a Better World.” Globalizations, 14:4, 504-518, DOI: 10.1080/14747731.2016.1254413

The resurgence over the past three decades of a cosmopolitan discourse is related to, on the one hand, the expansion of market-led globalisation and, on the other, the intensification of social and political mobilisation for social justice. The fall of the Berlin Wall introduced a vision of global unity predicated on the global spread of neo-liberal doctrines. Liberalisation, privatisation, and devolution fostered by global governance institutions—the World Bank, IMF, and WTO—affected the global dynamics of production, trade, and governance. Concurrently, a global culture began to develop carried by waves of consumer goods and by the flooding of the global airwaves (and fibre optics) with entertainment products which established or reinforced global cultural stereotypes and entrenched values of competition, individualism, and consumerism. Narratives about the survival of the fittest increasingly express human relationships and social arrangements

As neo-liberalism was hailed by conservative elites as the panacea to social problems and the engine of global development, its dark side was increasingly resisted in protests around the world targeting labour market deregulation, environmental degradation, poverty, inequality, and exploitation. Localised forms of resistance grew in scale with the intensification of electronic communication between activists. In 1999, weaving networks that criss-crossed the planet, an unprecedented activist convergence burst into the public scene in the Seattle mobilisation against the WTO. The critical mass achieved in Seattle moved in waves to successive demonstrations such as those against the World Bank and the IMF in Prague in 2000 or the G8 in Genoa in 2001 (Della Porta, Andretta, Mosca, & Reiter, 2006; Pleyers, 2010; Smith, Byrd, Reese, & Smythe, 2011). In January 2001, the first World Social Forum (WSF) took place in Porto Alegre, Brazil (Conway, 2013; Juris, 2008a; Teivainen, in press). Grown out of the alterglobalisation movement and shaped by Brazilian activists, WSF’s more recent roots lay in the anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist, peace, and pro-democracy movements since the 1960s and in the alternative NGO forums to the UN conferences of the 1990s (Correa Leite, 2003; Fisher & Ponniah, 2003; Glasius, 2005; Seoane & Taddei, 2002; Wallerstein, 2004; Waterman, 2004).

The WSF is the world’s largest and most diverse transnational activist initiative to date. Its global events in Brazil, India, Kenya, Mali, Pakistan, Venezuela, Senegal, Tunisia, and Canada, and the dozens of regional, national, and local avatars have gathered millions of participants and tens of thousands of civil society organisations and social movements (Massiah, 2011).1 The WSF was developed as a counter-event to the World Economic Forum (WEF), a gathering of the world’s wealthiest CEOs and most influential finance ministers, heads of government, and academics. Its meetings focus on market expansion and economic development. WSF’s activists, instead, stress social and environmental justice when imagining desirable futures. They privilege equity over individual wealth, harmony with over exploitation of the environment, and shared responsibility over profit. The WSF has been described as a global public sphere (Conway & Singh, 2009; Doerr, 2008; Glasius, 2005; Hardt, 2002), a global network of social movements (Byrd & Jasny, 2010; Juris, 2008a; Waterman, 2004), a utopian space (Tormey, 2005), a space of intentionality (Juris, 2008b), an embryonic party (ChaseDunn & Reese, 2007; Marcuse, 2005; Patomaki & Teivainen, 2004), or a contact zone (Conway, 2011) in which alliances develop transversally (Housseini, 2013) across multiple political cleavages (Santos, 2004).

WSF’s most inspiring political and organisational innovation has been the ‘open space’. The open space, a bottom-up and participatory methodology for social change, provides a context for the creation of knowledge and experience beyond a directive pursuit of change (Whitaker, 2005). This formula rallied unprecedented numbers of activists from very diverse backgrounds. The open space is the organisational representation of the political environment in which WSF’s open cosmopolitanism takes shape. WSF’s unique cosmopolitan vision is developed both as resistance against neo-liberal cosmopolitanism and as a methodology of individual and collective emancipation. The nature of WSF’s cosmopolitan aspiration has been discussed by Janet Conway and Boaventura de Souza Santos. Scholars familiar with the WSF, they framed WSF’s cosmopolitanism as decolonial (Conway 2011, 2013) 2 and subaltern (Santos, 2004, 2005a). Dialogue (Conway, 2012) and translation (Santos, 2005b) are among the strategies deployed to develop WSF’s field and to extend its reach across world society. The two authors differ in the understandings of the tensions and conflicts in the WSF. Santos sees the cleavages traversing the WSF as a guarantee of openness against the domination of one ideological and organisational form. Conway warns about power dynamics among WSF participants and points at the contradictions of a space in which structures of domination not only are not challenged, but through denial are also in fact strengthened.

WSF’s open cosmopolitanism, I argue, invokes a struggle for global justice built on dissent and resistance, driven by emancipatory aspirations, and fuelled by a global alliance against neo-liberal globalisation: dissent against any totalitarianism that denies social complexities, that attempts to subsume them forcefully, or that attempts to annihilate them; resistance against hegemonic lifeworlds; emancipatory because it is predicated on individuals’ and groups’ self-determination. In previous examinations, I have described the WSF in terms of ‘emancipatory cosmopolitanism’ (2012b) and ‘open cosmopolitanism’ (2012a). Here, I consider the latter as a recursive process of power and resistance, conflict and emancipation taking place both across and within the boundaries of WSF’s open space. Open cosmopolitanism understands that denied conflict between allies reinforces dynamics of domination and that courageous engagements of those conflicts, however painful and apparently destabilising of activists’ contingent goals, promote trust and, potentially, effectiveness (Caruso, 2004).

Open cosmopolitanism is not based on a blueprint, it develops in fits and starts, it is traversed by powerful ambivalences, it often suffers setbacks, and its outcomes are not foreseeable and are always open to reframing and reinterpretation as the activists’ work develops into new and previously unimaginable forms. Power dynamics, ideological cleavages, and pragmatic concerns about organisation, alliance building, and strategic efficacy traverse the open space and, according to some, challenge WSF’s ability to pursue its goals (Worth & Buckley, 2009; Zibechi, 2012). Criticism centred on the extent to which the excitement that the WSF generated among activists may be justified; on the gap between values and practices in the open space; on the disappointment generated by the unrealistic investments in the possibility for global social change afforded by the WSF; and, more recently, on the ability of the WSF to adapt to a changed political environment. Tensions, internal struggles, and critical analysis, I argue, contribute to make WSF’s cosmopolitan project, though apparently harder to achieve, more realistic (but by no means easier) than statements of universal solidarity among global activists or, even more, among all human beings united in a common destiny on a shared planet. When acknowledged and worked through, conflicts and power dynamics contribute to the recursive nature of the struggle for individual and collective emancipation. As conflicts are engaged and negotiated and as the ambivalent nature of human existence is made central to groups’ organisation, resistance to domination becomes the ground on which the alternative is constructed and emancipation can realistically be achieved. WSF’s open cosmopolitanism is here understood as the struggle between Empire and Cosmopolis as discussed by Gills (2005). This struggle is not only represented by the opposition of WSF’s Cosmopolis to the WEF’s Empire, but also, more broadly, as the struggle between two contending visions of human existence and global community. With Gills, I understand these contending visions as the expression of a ‘perennial historical tension, [which is] deeply embedded in history and human psyche’ (2005, p. 5). I have been involved in the WSF since 2002. The present article is based on material collected during participant observation in four continents complemented by extensive virtual ethnography and unstructured interviews.3 The remainder of this article is organised as follows. The next section discusses WSF’s founding cosmopolitan principles. The following introduces WSF’s cosmopolitan practices. Section 4 discusses conflict in the open space. Section 5 spells out WSF’s open cosmopolitanism. Section 6 concludes.

#### Combating injustice requires reclaiming democracy by creating new arenas to contest the who and how of politics.

Nancy Fraser 05. Henry A. and Louise Loeb Professor of Political and Social Science and professor of philosophy at The New School. “Reframing Justice in a Globalizing World, NLR 36, November–December 2005.” New Left Review. https://newleftreview-org.proxy.library.emory.edu/issues/ii36/articles/nancy-fraser-reframing-justice-in-a-globalizing-world

But the claims of transformative politics go further still. Above and beyond their other demands, these movements are also claiming a say in a post-Westphalian process of frame-setting. Rejecting the standard view, which deems frame-setting the prerogative of states and transnational elites, they are effectively aiming to democratize the process by which the frameworks of justice are drawn and revised. Asserting their right to participate in constituting the ‘who’ of justice, they are simultaneously transforming the ‘how’—by which I mean the accepted procedures for determining the ‘who’. At their most reflective and ambitious, accordingly, transformative movements are demanding the creation of new democratic arenas for entertaining arguments about the frame. In some cases, moreover, they are creating such arenas themselves. In the World Social Forum, for example, some practitioners of transformative politics have fashioned a transnational public sphere where they can participate on a par with others in airing and resolving disputes about the frame. In this way, they are prefiguring the possibility of new institutions of post-Westphalian democratic justice.footnote16

The democratizing dimension of transformative politics points to a third level of political injustice, above and beyond the two already discussed. Previously, I distinguished first-order injustices of ordinary-political misrepresentation from second-order injustices of misframing. Now, however, we can discern a third-order species of political injustice, which corresponds to the question of the ‘how’. Exemplified by undemocratic processes of frame-setting, this injustice consists in the failure to institutionalize parity of participation at the meta-political level, in deliberations and decisions concerning the ‘who’. Because what is at stake here is the process by which first-order political space is constituted, I shall call this injustice meta-political misrepresentation. Meta-political misrepresentation arises when states and transnational elites monopolize the activity of frame-setting, denying voice to those who may be harmed in the process, and blocking creation of democratic arenas where the latter’s claims can be vetted and redressed. The effect is to exclude the overwhelming majority of people from participation in the meta-discourses that determine the authoritative division of political space. Lacking any institutional arenas for such participation, and submitted to an undemocratic approach to the ‘how’, the majority is denied the chance to engage on terms of parity in decision-making about the ‘who’.

#### Open cosmopolitanism is a process, not a blueprint---the struggle, even if imperfect, is resistance.

Giuseppe Caruso 17. “Open Cosmopolitanism and the World Social Forum: Global Resistance, Emancipation, and the Activists’ Vision of a Better World.” Globalizations, 14:4, 504-518, DOI: 10.1080/14747731.2016.1254413

Open cosmopolitanism represents WSF’s end, its journey, and its mode of travel. Both aspirations and realisations develop through recursive conflicts between multiple instantiations, historical and psychological, of Empire and Cosmopolis. Open cosmopolitanism is not based on blueprints. It is a work in process, impossible to uniquely define. Open cosmopolitanism invokes a recursive process of emancipation. It is about freeing, just as much as it is about freedom. It is about opening, just as much as it is about openness. It is not built on the assumption of universality, but on continued struggles to confront the conflicts that traverse global society. The following passage illustrates WSF’s conception of resistance and alternatives as one:

To imagine that another world is possible is a creative act to make it possible. The WSF releases contradictions and makes them operate, catalyzing, liberating creative energies. [ ... ] The WSF intends to be a space to facilitate pulling together and strengthening an international coalition of the most diverse social movements and organizations, adhering to the principle of respect for differences, autonomy of ideas, and forms of struggle. [ ... ] It’s an initiative of the emerging planetary civil society. [ ... ] It’s a movement of ideas that feeds on human diversity and possibilities, opposing the ‘single way of thinking’. [ ... ] The WSF is a living laboratory for world citizenship. (WSF, 2003, original italics)

Resistance and experimentation gather energy from recursive processes of individual and collective emancipation taking place across multiple conflicts both within and without WSF’s open space. This also explains the emergent nature and the mutually constitutive relationship between WSF’s cosmopolitan imaginations, practices of resistance, and new solidarities. Justice, equality, self- and collective realisation, mutual recognition, and radical democracy are, at the same time, methodologies and objectives of WSF’s open cosmopolitanism. The multiple paths it explores are traced by the prevalence of collective work over basic assumptions of ‘equality in the struggle’ and are grounded on values supporting creative thinking: curiosity, empathy, and solidarity.

#### We need new research agendas. Political and social theory must be redefined.

Ulrich Beck and Natan Sznaider 10. Ulrich Beck. Department of Sociology, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universitat Munich. Natan Sznaider, School of Behavioral Sciences, Academic College of Tel-Aviv Yaffo, Israel. "Unpacking cosmopolitanism for the social sciences: a research agenda". Wiley Online Library. 1-15-2010. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2009.01250.x

Indeed, the basic idea behind this special issue of the British Journal of Sociology is that ‘the light of the great cultural problems has moved on’ from a nation-state definition of society and politics to a cosmopolitan outlook. At this point the humanities and social sciences need to get ready for a transformation of their own positions and conceptual equipment – that is, to take cosmopolitanism as a research agenda seriously and raise some of the key conceptual, methodological, empirical and normative issues that the cosmopolitanization of reality poses for the social sciences. The intellectual undertaking of redefining cosmopolitanism is a trans-disciplinary one, which includes geography, anthropology, ethnology, international relations, international law, political philosophy and political theory, and now sociology and social theory (see Beck and Sznaider 2006). Cosmopolitanism is, of course, a contested term; there is no uniform interpretation of it in the growing literature. The boundaries separating it from competitive terms like globalization, transnationalism, universalism, glocalization etc. are not distinct and internally it is traversed by all kind of fault lines. Yet we will argue that the neo-cosmopolitanism in the social sciences –‘realistic cosmopolitanism’ or ‘cosmopolitan realism’– is an identifiable intellectual movement united by at least three interconnected commitments:

First, the shared critique of methodological nationalism which blinds conventional sociology to the multi-dimensional process of change that has irreversibly transformed the very nature of the social world and the place of states within that world. Methodological nationalism does not mean (as the term ‘methodological individualism’ suggests) that one or many sociologists have consciously created an explicit methodology (theory) based on an explicit nationalism. The argument rather goes that social scientists in doing research or theorizing take it for granted that society is equated with national society, as Durkheim does when he reflects on the integration of society. He, of course, has in mind the integration of the national society (France) without even mentioning, naming or thinking about it. In fact, not using the adjective ‘national’ as a universal language does not falsify but might sometimes even prove methodological nationalism. That is the case when the practice of the argument or the research presupposes that the unit of analysis is the national society or the national state or the combination of both. The concept of methodological nationalism is not a concept of methodology but of the sociology of sociology or the sociology of social theory.

Second, the shared diagnosis that the twenty-first century is becoming an age of cosmopolitanism. This could and should be compared with other historical moments of cosmopolitanism, such as those in ancient Greece, the Alexandrian empire and the Enlightenment. In the 1960s Hannah Arendt analysed the Human Condition, in the 1970s Francois Lyotard the Postmodern Condition. Now at the beginning of the twenty-first century we have to discover, map and understand the Cosmopolitan Condition.

Third, there is a shared assumption that for this purpose we need some kind of ‘methodological cosmopolitanism’. Of course, there is a lot of controversy about what this means. The main point for us lies in the fact that the dualities of the global and the local, the national and the international, us and them, have dissolved and merged together in new forms that require conceptual and empirical analysis. The outcome of this is that the concept and phenomena of cosmopolitanism are not spatially fixed; the term itself is not tied to the ‘cosmos’ or the ‘globe’, and it certainly does not encompass ‘everything’. The principle of cosmopolitanism can be found in specific forms at every level and can be practiced in every field of social and political action: in international organizations, in bi-national families, in neighbourhoods, in global cities, in transnationalized military organizations, in the management of multi-national co-operations, in production networks, human rights organizations, among ecology activists and the paradoxical global opposition to globalization.

Critique of methodological nationalism

Methodological nationalism takes the following premises for granted: it equates societies with nation-state societies and sees states and their governments as the primary focus of social-scientific analysis. It assumes that humanity is naturally divided into a limited number of nations, which organize themselves internally as nation-states and externally set boundaries to distinguish themselves from other nation-states. And it goes further: this outer delimitation as well as the competition between nation-states, represent the most fundamental category of political organization.

The premises of the social sciences assume the collapse of social boundaries with state boundaries, believing that social action occurs primarily within and only secondarily across, these divisions:

[Like] stamp collecting . . . social scientists collected distinctive national social forms. Japanese industrial relations, German national character, the American constitution, the British class system – not to mention the more exotic institutions of tribal societies – were the currency of social research. The core disciplines of the social sciences, whose intellectual traditions are reference points for each other and for other fields, were therefore domesticated– in the sense of being preoccupied not with Western and world civilization as wholes but with the ‘domestic’ forms of particular national societies (Shaw 2000: 68).

The critique of methodological nationalism should not be confused with the thesis that the end of the nation-state has arrived. One does not criticize methodological individualism by proclaiming the end of the individual. Nation-states (as all the research shows – see also the different contributions in this volume) will continue to thrive or will be transformed into transnational states. What, then, is the main point of the critique of methodological nationalism? It adopts categories of practice as categories of analysis. The decisive point is that national organization as a structuring principle of societal and political action can no longer serve as the orienting reference point for the social scientific observer. One cannot even understand the re-nationalization or re-ethnification trend in Western or Eastern Europe without a cosmopolitan perspective. In this sense, the social sciences can only respond adequately to the challenge of globalization if they manage to overcome methodological nationalism and to raise empirically and theoretically fundamental questions within specialized fields of research, and thereby elaborate the foundations of a newly formulated cosmopolitan social science.

As many authors – including the ones in this volume – criticize, in the growing discourse on cosmopolitanism there is a danger of fusing the ideal with the real. What cosmopolitanism is cannot ultimately be separated from what cosmopolitanism should be. But the same is true of nationalism. The small, but important, difference is that in the case of nationalism the value judgment of the social scientists goes unnoticed because methodological nationalism includes a naturalized conception of nations as real communities. In the case of the cosmopolitan ‘Wertbeziehung’ (Max Weber, value relation), by contrast, this silent commitment to a nation-state centred outlook of sociology appears problematic.

In order to unpack the argument in the two cases it is necessary to distinguish between the actor perspective and the observer perspective. From this it follows that a sharp distinction should be made between methodological and normative nationalism. The former is linked to the social-scientific observer perspective, whereas the latter refers to the negotiation perspectives of political actors. In a normative sense, nationalism means that every nation has the right to self-determination within the context of its cultural, political and even geographical boundaries and distinctiveness. Methodological nationalism assumes this normative claim as a socio-ontological given and simultaneously links it to the most important conflict and organization orientations of society and politics. These basic tenets have become the main perceptual grid of the social sciences. Indeed, this social-scientific stance is part of the nation-state's own self-understanding. A national view on society and politics, law, justice, memory and history governs the sociological imagination. To some extent, much of the social sciences has become a prisoner of the nation-state. That this was not always the case is shown in Bryan Turner's paper in this issue (Turner 2006: 133–51). This does not mean, of course, that a cosmopolitan social science can and should ignore different national traditions of law, history, politics and memory. These traditions exist and become part of our cosmopolitan methodology. The comparative analyses of societies, international relations, political theory, and a significant part of history and law all essentially function on the basis of methodological nationalism. This is valid to the extent that the majority of positions in the contemporary debates in social and political science over globalization can be systematically interpreted as transdisciplinary reflexes linked to methodological nationalism.

These premises also structure empirical research, for example, in the choice of statistical indicators, which are almost always exclusively national. A refutation of methodological nationalism from a strictly empirical viewpoint is therefore difficult, indeed, almost impossible, because so many statistical categories and research procedures are based on it. It is therefore of historical importance for the future development of the social sciences that this methodological nationalism, as well as the related categories of perception and disciplinary organization, be theoretically, empirically, and organizationally re-assessed and reformed.

What is at stake here? Whereas in the case of the nation-state centred perspective there is an historical correspondence between normative and methodological nationalism (and for this reason this correspondence has mainly remained latent), this does not hold for the relationship between normative and methodological cosmopolitanism. In fact, the opposite is true: even the re-nationalization or re-ethnification of minds, cultures and institutions has to be analysed within a cosmopolitan frame of reference.

Cosmopolitan social science entails the systematic breaking up of the process through which the national perspective of politics and society, as well as the methodological nationalism of political science, sociology, history, and law, confirm and strengthen each other in their definitions of reality. Thus it also tackles (what had previously been analytically excluded as a sort of conspiracy of silence of conflicting basic convictions) the various developmental versions of de-bounded politics and society, corresponding research questions and programmes, the strategic expansions of the national and international political fields, as well as basic transformations in the domains of state, politics, and society.

This paradigmatic de-construction and re-construction of the social sciences from a national to a cosmopolitan outlook can be understood and methodologically justified as a ‘positive problem shift’ (Lakatos 1970), a broadening of horizons for social science research making visible new realities encouraging new research programmes (Beck and Lau 2005; Beck, Bonss and Lau 2003: 1–35). Against the background of cosmopolitan social science, it suddenly becomes obvious that it is neither possible to distinguish clearly between the national and the international, nor, correspondingly, to make a convincing contrast between homogeneous units. National spaces have become denationalized, so that the national is no longer national, just as the international is no longer international. New realities are arising: a new mapping of space and time, new co-ordinates for the social and the political are emerging which have to be theoretically and empirically researched and elaborated.

This entails a re-examination of the fundamental concepts of ‘modern society’. Household, family, class, social inequality, democracy, power, state, commerce, public, community, justice, law, history, memory and politics must be released from the fetters of methodological nationalism, re-conceptualized, and empirically established within the framework of a new cosmopolitan social and political science. It would be hard to understate the scope of this task. But nevertheless it has to be taken up if the social sciences want to avoid becoming a museum of antiquated ideas.

#### Cosmopolitan dialogue opens up transformative space for social struggles.

Gerard Delanty 14. University of Sussex, UK “The prospects of cosmopolitanism and the possibility of global justice.” Journal of Sociology 2014, Vol. 50(2) 213–228 https://www.sciencespo.fr/ceri/plurispace/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/DELANTY\_Prospects-Cosmopolitanism.pdf

It is in the first instance a condition of openness to the world in the sense of the broadening of the moral and political horizon of societies. It entails a view of societies as connected rather than separated. Cosmopolitanism is made possible by the fact that individuals, groups, publics, societies have a capacity for learning in dealing with problems and, in particular, learning from each other. In this sense, then, cosmopolitanism is not a matter of diversity or mobility, but a process of learning. Dialogue is a key feature of cosmopolitanism since dialogue opens up the possibility of incorporating the perspective of others into one’s own view of the world. It can thus be associated with a communicative view of modernity. Rather than being an affirmative condition, it is transformative and is produced by social struggles rather than being primarily elite driven or entirely institutional. In this sense, cosmopolitanism can be related to popular and vernacular traditions rather than exclusively to the projects of elites (see Holton, 2009). From an epistemological perspective, cosmopolitanism involves the production of essentially critical knowledge, such as the identification of transformative potentials within the present.

Finally, cosmopolitanism is related to subject formation: it is constitutive of the self as much as it is of social and political processes. This is reflected in the von Humboldtian – in this case Wilhelm von Humboldt’s – understanding of cosmopolitanism as a particular kind of consciousness that is best exemplified in education. In the acquisition of knowledge, the self undergoes a transformation, for Bildung is a form of self-formation and occurs through the encounter of the individual with the world. Bildung is a means of encountering the universal, as reflected in the category of the world, and is the aim of education.

These features of cosmopolitanism challenge the received view of normative ideas, such as global justice as transcending political community or as simply utopian. The conception of cosmopolitanism I am putting forward is that it is constitutive of modernity and part of the make-up of political community. This is why cosmopolitanism is not a zero sum condition – either present or absent – as its critics often argue and its defenders mistakenly argue in its support. It is present to varying degrees in contemporary societies.

In order to assess the prospects of cosmopolitanism it is therefore necessary to determine the extent to which cosmopolitan phenomena are present in the cultural model of societies and in their modes of social organization and institutions. By the cultural model, I mean the social imaginary of societies, that is the dominant forms of collective identity or self-understanding. The cultural model of all modern societies involves the amplification and metamorphosis of transcultural ideas such as liberty, justice, freedom, autonomy, rights, which of course are variously interpreted and are not always fully institutionalized. But the existence of such ideas (essentially meta-norms), means that societies have the cognitive means of reaching beyond themselves. For this reason, there is generally a tension in modern societies between the cultural model and institutions. Related to these levels of analysis is the dimension of subject formation, the cosmopolitan self. It is possible that any one time in the history of a society there is a tension between subject formation, the cultural model of society, and social institutions. It is for this reason that cosmopolitanism can be seen as a critical theory of society (see Delanty, 2009): it shares with the critical heritage the concern with possibilities within the present or the immanent transcendence of society.

I am emphasizing, then, the formative dimensions of cosmopolitanism, which in other words is a structure forming itself out of both the self and society. It entails a subject (the cosmopolitan subject), a discourse in which ideas, knowledge, modes of cognition are produced, and social practices. Viewed in such terms, cosmopolitanism is a process as opposed to a fixed condition. It is marked by conflict, contradictions, negotiation. The implications of this view are that evidence of cosmopolitanism must be found not in an end state – a cosmopolitan society or state as opposed to a non-cosmopolitan one – but in the process by which it emerges. It is the task of sociology to determine whether and how this process is occurring.

#### Our political imaginary is possible and desirable.

Gerard Delanty 14. University of Sussex, UK “The prospects of cosmopolitanism and the possibility of global justice.” Journal of Sociology 2014, Vol. 50(2) 213–228 https://www.sciencespo.fr/ceri/plurispace/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/DELANTY\_Prospects-Cosmopolitanism.pdf

The notion that global justice is both a challenge and a possibility is a relatively new idea.1 Notions of justice have traditionally been confined to territorially limited political communities, generally nation-states, and global justice seen as a secondary or derivative matter. It was not very long ago that all questions of justice were thought to pertain to nationally defined political communities. This was certainly the assumption that Rawls made in A Theory of Justice in 1971, and which set the terms of debate for more than four decades. In the past two decades there has been a steady increase in what may be called discourses of global justice – including theoretical conceptualizations – and political practices that reflect notions of global justice. It would appear that global justice has become part of the Zeitgeist or the political imaginary of critical publics in contemporary societies as they address a range of global challenges.

To create new or possible worlds it is first of all necessary to be able to imagine them. The fact that we are unsure of what exactly constitutes global justice, but nonetheless speak of it, suggests that it is a reality of a certain kind. One might say it is a reality creating idea. The reality of global justice can now be declared to be a constitutive feature of political community. It is a way of judging the world and a way of thinking about the world, as well as a way of examining the world that challenges the exclusivity of national borders as determining the boundaries of justice. Global justice has a normative, a cognitive and an epistemological dimension: it offers principles against which injustice can be measured, it offers a language to speak about human interconnectedness, and it is a topic on which knowledge can be acquired through social research. The concern with global justice is central to the idea of cosmopolitanism, though not the only aspect of cosmopolitanism. In this article I am largely concerned with the political dimension of cosmopolitanism, which I see as the context in which to discuss global justice. The aim of the article is to explore the considerations that are at stake in assessing the prospects of cosmopolitanism today as a political project. I argue that there is scope for fruitful dialogue between sociology and political science around this question, which asks how a normative idea becomes an empirical phenomenon. In the first section I discuss the notion of global justice before outlining a theoretical approach to the analysis of cosmopolitanism. The third section of the article moves on to look at the conditions of the possibility of cosmopolitanism, before finally considering the prospects of cosmopolitanism.

#### We should create institutional loci for internationalism.

Daniele Archibugi 04. London School of Economics and Political Science, London, UK and Italian National Research Council, Italy European Journal of International Relations Copyright 2004. “Cosmopolitan Democracy and its Critics: A Review”. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Daniele-Archibugi-2/publication/240701697\_Cosmopolitan\_Democracy\_and\_Its\_Critics\_A\_Review/links/5cc861b5299bf120978b3022/Cosmopolitan-Democracy-and-Its-Critics-A-Review.pdf

Marxist analysis maintains the existence of a permanent conflict of interests between rival social classes; interests that — now more than in the past — are in conflict not only within states, but also between states. The creation of a global citizenship will not put an end to these conflicts of interest, but that is not the ambition inspiring it. Its goal is simply to find institutional loci where these conflicts of interest could possibly be addressed and managed. If the prolonged civil war in Sierra Leone were somehow linked to the diamond trade, and the traders from Anvers, Moscow or New York were thought to play an effective role in promoting the instigation of the hostilities, what kind of institutional channels might prove effective in resolving the issue? Policies that are decided within international institutions — such as the certification of the diamonds’ origin — offer the possibility of mitigating the conflict. In other words, global institutions should offer effective channels for mending conflicts.

What needs to be revised is the political programme — not the spirit — of proletarian internationalism. Cosmopolitan democracy suggests the creation of institutions and representative channels not limited to a specific social class, but open to all individuals. Its aim is not to overcome social classes, but an objective more modest but equally ambitious — offering channels of direct representation to all people at the global level, regardless of their social status. This implies basing decision-making on global issues on the preferences of a majority, rather than on those of a single class. In this vein, Ulrich Beck (1999: 18) invoked, ‘Citizens of the world, unite!’

Trans-national campaigns have already succeeded in influencing the choices of political decision-makers — take the decision of the UK government to follow environmentally friendly procedures for the disposal of the Brent Spar (Prins and Sellwood, 1998); the institution of the International Criminal Court (Glasius, 2002); the decision of some multinationals to recede from their profit-making interests and allow for the free diffusion of the AIDS drug (Seckinelgin, 2002), or even military interventions to protect human rights (Kaldor, 2001). An international public sphere (Koehler, 1998; Cochran, 2002) is moving towards public action, and some partial but nevertheless significant results have been achieved (Pianta, 2003).

# 2AC

## Topicality/Framework

#### We will explicitly concede debate over antitrust policy shapes our research, mechanism, and interactions---the 1AC is an impact turn and it outweighs any in round loss of fairness. Forced affirmation of the resolution is not neutral but a constant attempt to reinforce taken-for-granted nationalism through concepts of competition that search for the anticompetitiveness and punish it which causes endless war---that’s Kettunen. Requirements that dialogue or debate start from competition fixes the gaze of our research agenda---it necessitates otherization and comparative reflexivity.

Pauli Kettunen 21. Professor of Political History in the Social Science Faculty of University of Helsinki. "Welfare state, competition state, security state: Nationalism in nation-state responses to crossborder mobilities." In Remapping Security on Europe’s Northern Borders, pp. 201-220. Routledge, 2021.

Reforming the welfare state in the direction of the competition state clearly differs from Myrdal’s vision of expanding it into a welfare world. Critical visions of global policies could be opened from the universalistic principles of the national welfare state, as Myrdal, and later Pekka Kuusi (1985), did. Transforming the welfare state in the direction of the competition state fixes the gaze on national agency in a way that closes the window to such visions. “Welfare” does not itself imply a distinction between us and others; “competitiveness” does.

The importance of comparisons in national politics is no novelty, yet promoting the competitiveness of a nation in global competition implies new requirements of comparative reflexivity. “We” within a given territorial – local, regional, European, yet in the first place national – framework are supposed to make us attractive and competitive in the face of those who compare different environments from a transnational perspective in their decision making regarding flows of money, investment, and the location of production and jobs. This means being able to constantly assess one’s own actions and capacities from the varying and changing positions of those actors who compare us with others. In addition to divisions between us and others, the distinction between the internal and external is reproduced. Globalisation, notably the crossborder mobility of capital, is naturalised as necessities of external environment; national society is commodified as a competitive community.

#### Interpretation is socio-ontological commitment---that’s Beck---the 1NC furthers methodological nationalism through OECD definitions tied to national scales and “its” as singular and possessive.

Sarah A Moore et al. 18. PhD, University of Kentucky, 2006. Heather Rosenfeld, Eric Nost, Kristen Vincent, Robert E Roth. "Undermining methodological nationalism: Cosmopolitan analysis and visualization of the North American hazardous waste trade". SAGE Journals. 6-29-2018. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0308518X18784023

Reifying the nation-state: Regulation of the transnational hazardous waste trade

Concern about the possibility of uneven, unjust, and potentially dangerous transboundary hazardous waste shipments between countries has generated significant international regulation in the last two decades. The Basel Convention came into effect in 1992 and was revised in 1998 (OECD, 2009). Through prior informed consent procedures, it regulates richer countries’ exports of hazardous waste to poorer countries, arguably reducing the emergence of pollution havens. The Basel Convention has been ratified by 172 nations, including Canada and Mexico; the United States signed the agreement in the early 1990s, but has yet to ratify it. NAFTA has increased industrial activity and waste trading between the US and Canada and the US and Mexico, but does not itself specifically harmonize waste definitions or regulations (though this was one goal of the CEC; CEC, 2011). Instead, the trade relies upon previous bilateral, waste-specific agreements.

Much of the current data on the international hazardous waste trade has been created as a consequence of the Basel Convention, which requires countries to report certain export and import shipments at the scale of the nation-state. Other datasets include those from the OECD (n.d.) and the United Nations Statistics Division COMTRADE database, also reported at the nation-state level (Lepawsky, 2015a, 2015b). This is a significant hindrance to understanding hazardous waste trading, not just because Basel Convention data excludes the US, but also because such regulatory structures define, and thereby reify, the scale at which phenomena such as the transnational trade in hazardous waste are tracked and regulated. In other words, methodological nationalism is inherent to most transnational agreements and bodies, thereby making it difficult to gather data at other scales. This is a problem because, although transnational agreements may prevent any one country from bearing a disproportionate burden of risk from hazardous waste, specific localities and communities within countries may still be differentially affected. Understanding the transnational hazardous waste trade and potential risks associated with it, therefore, requires the creation and analysis of novel datasets.

#### Forced intelligibility is ontological violence---expression is defined by incommensurate filters and the 1NC continues the Western cosmological assumption that we can and should only relate to what we understand---it removes value while minimizing and denigrating all life---that’s Trownsell. Rules must be open to contestation.

Nicholas C. BURBULES 2K, Professor of Education at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign [“The Limits of Dialogue as a Critical Pedagogy” in *Revolutionary Pedagogies*, ed. by Peter Trifonas, 2000, p.265-267, Accessed Online through Emory Libraries]

The major contemporary critic of the prescriptive model of dialogue and its virtually unquestioned role in critical pedagogy is Elizabeth Ellsworth. Her current critique focuses on considering dialogue as a “mode of address,” one that positions teacher and learner in a determinate relation (even one that is ostensibly egalitarian) and, in so doing, constrains the possibilities of communicative exchange, no matter how “open” it aspires to be. Instead, Ellsworth calls for “pedagogical modes of address that aren’t founded on striving for and desiring certainty, continuity, and control” and “pedagogical modes of address that multiply and set in motion the positions from which they can be ‘met’ and responded to.” 24 Referring in part directly to some of my own earlier work, she writes,

By communicative dialogue, I mean a controlled process of interaction that seeks successful communication, defined as the moment of full understanding. For those who advocate it in education, communicative dialogue drives toward mutual understanding as a pedagogical ideal. . . . In other words, what must come first in communicative dialogue is understanding— that is, a supposedly innocent, disinterested reading of the other’s message. Then disagreement is allowed. . . . What communicative dialogue cannot tolerate, what it must exclude, is the one who says, “Our differences are such that you cannot understand me, and I cannot understand you.”. . . Communicative dialogue works only when we act as if its mode of address is a neutral conduit of reality, and not itself a rhetoric— not itself a mediation of knowledge and of its participants’ relations to knowledge. 25

I think that this criticism is basically correct: a conception of dialogue based on the idea that “successful communication” can only mean “full understanding,” and the idea that dialogue is, or can be, a “neutral conduit of reality,” itself proof from question, is entirely inadequate— even damaging. There are many cases in which the striving for understanding (or agreement) at all costs will run roughshod over individual or group differences that cannot be bridged easily or reconciled with dominant understandings. It must be seen that dialogue can be “successful” just in [END PAGE 265] the sense of bringing to light the experience and perspectives of others quite different from ourselves (and this can be a kind of success even when we cannot entirely understand, let along agree, with them). Ellsworth is right that the ideal of “dialogue” can become an actual impediment to human freedom, diversity, and coexistence. Moreover, Ellsworth is also right that, if the implicit communicative rules and aims of a dialogical engagement cannot themselves be questioned or challenged, reflexively, from within the dialogue, then not only will certain voices or perspectives be excluded from possible participation, but the medium of dialogue itself becomes a way of structuring interpersonal knowledge and understanding, in a decidedly nonneutral way, without recourse to considering alternative frames that might be possible.

What puzzles me about Ellsworth’s criticisms of “communicative dialogue” is, first of all, to wonder where she finds such a caricatured view of dialogue in my own work (where I have repeatedly said that knowledge, agreement, and understanding are only some of the potential outcomes of dialogue; that dialogue sometimes encounters differences that surpass our ability to understand them and lead to unreconciled disagreement; and that these, too, can foster important educational benefits and learning opportunities). 26 But of greater concern to me is whether Ellsworth thinks that, having disposed of “communicative dialogue,” in the sense she describes it, one has refuted somehow the idea of dialogue itself. Sometimes she has written as if she thinks that she has. 27 But in her latest work, in fact, she actually defends an alternative ideal of dialogue, which she terms (following psychoanalytic theory) “analytic dialogue”:

What gets “analyzed”. . . is the route of a reading. How did you arrive at this interpretation, without knowing it— maybe even without desiring it? How have your/our passages through history, power, desire, and language on the way to this interpretation become integral parts of the very structure of the interpretation— of our knowledge? 28

I believe that Ellsworth is exploring here a crucial sense in which any communicative form, including “dialogue,” needs to be subject to question itself. No medium is neutral, no utterance or observation can claim an entirely disinterested or nonpositioned vantage point. Whenever any pedagogical practice or relation becomes “naturalized” and comes to be seen as the only possibility, the best possibility, or the most “politically correct” possibility, it becomes (ironically) an impediment to human freedom, diversity, exploration, and— therefore— the possibilities of learning and discovery. As I have noted, in many accounts of dialogue and pedagogy the “fetishization” of dialogue has obscured some of its real limitations and contradictions. Moreover, the proclamation of any particular dialogical genre as the instrument [END PAGE 266] of human emancipation (such as the Socratic method, Freirean pedagogy, or a Habermasian search for consensus) will inevitably exclude, silence, or normalize others from radically different subject positions. I and other theorists working on these topics owe appreciation to Ellsworth, Patti Lather, Mary Leach, Alison Jones, and other feminist poststructural critics for pressing this issue so strongly.

#### Agonism and clash don’t require limits, predictability, or stasis---radical contestation is a requirement for cosmopolitan democracy

Paulina Tambakaki 15 Senior Lecturer Political Theory @ Centre for Study of Democracy @ Westminster (UK) ’15 in Reclaiming Democracy eds. Albena Azmanova & Mihaela Mihai p. 21-22

Agonism and Representative Democracy

Seeking to identify the ways in which agonistic theorists approach representative democracy (and institutions of representation in particular) is, in the first instance, a straightforward task. Theorists who subscribe to agonism, such as William Connolly, Bonnie Honig, Chantal Mouffe, and James Tully, to name a few, immediately agree that (state and representative) institutions, although key to the workings of democratic regimes, neither exemplify nor exhaust democratic life (Honig 1993; Connolly 1991, 1995; Mouffe 1993; Tully 1995). This is, first, because democratic life, through the agonistic lens, always exceeds institutional and procedural blueprints and cannot be confined to particular sites or reduced to the particular forms and identities that institutional politics sets. As Honig puts it, ‘the always imperfect closure of political space tends to engender remainders . . . [that may] destabilise the very closures that deny their existence’ (1993, 15). Remainders, therefore, or simply put, ever-present differences, which do not conform to dominant standards or are excluded from particular configurations, exceeding and escaping these, always (return to) contest and disrupt institutional closures. This reveals that democratic politics not only has the potential to normalise, close off, and exclude differences that do not conform to the rules it frames (particularly in its institutional form), but also, crucially for us here, has the potential to disrupt and unsettle institutions, if and when differences are expressed in the political arena.

This last point brings us to the second, related, reason why representative institutions do not exhaust democratic life according to agonistic theorists. Given that frontiers between ‘us’ and ‘them,’ relations of identity/difference, constitute a necessary component of pluralistic democracy, democracy for agonistic theorists rests on openness and thrives on strife. Conceived as an agon, a political activity and attitude of contestation, strife exposes hegemonies through the agonistic lens, bolsters pluralism (by ensuring that democratic imaginaries remain open to different interpretations), and stirs democratic renewal. Neither dispensable nor a problem to be solved, therefore, strife means politics in the agonistic vocabulary, and points to the idea that a vibrant democracy might not call for simply an institutional haven, but also the cultivation of such ethos of contestation. Thus, what we notice here is that the case for contestatory politics, which agonistic theorists put forward, does not simply proceed from the onto-political assumption that institutional mechanisms fail to capture (and, inevitably, represent) the whole of democratic life, because differences (excesses or remainders) always escape and challenge their workings, but also from the assumption that the challenge these differences pose to institutions equally constitutes democracy. Indeed, the very emphasis which agonistic theorists put on the democratic nature of the agon both displaces institutions and representative processes (such as voting) from the centre of democratic theorizing and questions institutional workings—or, to be more precise, it alerts us to their (mis)workings.

James Tully’s work (1995, 2008a) gives us a clear idea of what these institutional (mis)workings are, which agonism wards off: first, norm framing, that is, the settling of norms, which disqualify and exclude the multiplicity of voices and activities constitutive of the human condition; second, ‘inherited languages of description and reflection’ that restrict our ability to understand, affirm, and redescribe that which escapes the vocabulary we are accustomed to (for example, the language of modem citizenship that often prevents us from grasping the ‘democratic’ aspect of new practices of freedom); and, third, the dispersion of practices of governance and freedom (as a result of globalisation) along with the ways this dispersion challenges modem representative politics. These dangers, which Tully explores throughout his work, are interrelated in that his analysis of their implications for political thinking revolves around one particular aspect that they all share in common, namely, the idea of a ‘limit.’ A limit, explains Tully, means:

. . . either the characteristic forms of thought and action which are taken for granted and not questioned or contested by participants in a practice of subjectivity, thereby functioning as the implicit background or horizon of their questions and contests, or it can mean that a form of subjectivity (its form of reason, norms of conduct and so forth) is explicitly claimed to be a limit that cannot be otherwise because it is universal, necessary or obligatory (the standard form of legitimation since the Enlightenment).

x (2008a, 75)

Read, therefore, against the background of this (Foucauldian) idea of a ‘limit,’ it appears that what specifically concerns Tully and other agonistic theorists when it comes to institutions is the way in which they settle and limit norms of thinking and acting, thus constraining us to think and act otherwise. From this reading, then, it immediately follows that a democracy reduced to institutions could be, and often is, a ‘limit’ democracy—since it ticks all the boxes of what Tully explains to be a ‘limit practice’: its norms and practices are dominant and settled (by representative institutions) and its limiting language of description and reflection is increasingly failing us to grapple with the effects of globalisation. To grapple, therefore, with these effects, and to question, in the process, the limit-practices of state democracy, Tully, along with other agonistic theorists, problématisés further the link between democracy and representative institutions. This brings us to the third reason that explains the distance between agonism and institutional democracy. This reason becomes more apparent when we look at recent agonistic writings.

#### We meet---the 1AC is “resolved:” over the resolution because it analyzes and deals with its elements---solves their offense.

Merriam-Websterhttps://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/resolve

Definition of resolve

resolved; resolving

transitive verb

1 obsolete : dissolve, melt

2 a : break up, separate the prism resolved the light into a play of color; also : to change by disintegration

b : to reduce by analysis resolve the problem into simple elements

c : to distinguish between or make independently visible adjacent parts of

d : to separate (a racemic compound or mixture) into the two components

3 : to cause resolution of (a pathological state)

4 a : to deal with successfully : clear up resolve doubts resolve a dispute

b : to find an answer to

c : to make clear or understandable

d : to find a mathematical solution of

e : to split up into two or more components especially in assigned directions resolve a vector

5 : to reach a firm decision about resolve to get more sleep resolve disputed points in a text

6 a : to declare or decide by a formal resolution and vote

b : to change by resolution or formal vote the house resolved itself into a committee

7 : to make (something, such as one or more voice parts or the total musical harmony) progress from dissonance to consonance

8 : to work out the resolution of (something, such as a play)

#### Procedural limitation is bad---locks out radical politics in the name of debate.

Lois MCNAY 14, Professor of Political Theory at Oxford University and Fellow of Somerville College [*The Misguided Search for the Political*, 2014, p. 42-44]

Bourdieu is not alone in making such a criticism of Habermasian deliberation. The argument that it pays insufficient attention to the subtle relations of power that skew any speech situation in favour of some speakers rather than others is by now familiar (e.g. McNay 2008a; Ranciere 1999; Sanders 1997). Furthermore, Habermas and his followers have gone some way in revising the strong rationalism of deliberation which is held to be the principal reason why certain groups have difficulty in articulating their experiences as moral claims and being taken seriously as political subjects. The critique of social weightlessness has more bite, however, than simply drawing attention to the suppressed context of power that subtly influences any speech act. For it also casts doubt on the rationale of theoretical approaches whose main aim is to isolate an essential political logic (deliberation or otherwise) and, on this basis, construct a definitive model of democracy. The focus on universally valid procedures may mean that the theorist prioritizes the integrity of the abstract [END PAGE 42] model per se regardless of the conflicting evidence of practice. From this perspective, the 'silence' of oppressed groups is indicative not just of an inability to express oneself formally but also of the limits of the deliberative paradigm itself vis-a-vis certain radical demands. Even when marginal groups articulate their grievances in the prescribed manner, they are still often disregarded. The perspective of social suffering draws attention to the tacit norms that are set in play by supposedly inclusive models of the political that in fact may have deeply exclusionary effects. For instance, coercion, violence and the mobilization of extreme emotions are ruled out a priori by deliberative thinkers as illegitimate political strategies because of their potentially destabilizing effects on democratic debate. Yet in the context of hierarchical social relationships, these strategies can be important, even necessary, political tools for rendering visible those oppressions and injustices that remain below the threshold of public perception or that, even when they have been given voice, have not been taken seriously by the dominant. Historically, as various thinkers have shown, marginalized and excluded groups have more often than not had to resort to what are deemed to be 'coercive' techniques - civil disobedience, strikes, boycotts, and so forth - to gain entry into democratic debate and be taken seriously (Medearis 2005; see also Stears 2010: 1-14). The resort to coercive, even violent, actions is testament to how, even when oppressed groups adhere to the rules of the political game, they are still just not heard: 'The social problems that they wish to address are effectively invisible to others' (Medearis 2005: 53). In short, there are aspects to the political process of challenging domination, things that need to be done to overcome it, that cannot be captured by simply putting them into words, by limiting them to 'the regulated confrontations of a rational dialogue that knows and recognizes no other force than that of arguments' (Bourdieu 2000: 73).

In presenting deliberation as beyond power, as grounded in abstract and supposedly neutral competences rather than as inseparable from contingent political struggles, Habermas and his followers are unwilling to consider deeply enough the limits of the universal validity of their paradigm. What is presented as an abstract capacity is in fact an expression of a linguistic universalism, the tacit generalization of a dominant way of being as a universal norm (Bourdieu 2000). The resort to coercive strategies on the part of subordinated groups to gain entry into democratic debate reveals ways in which deliberation may foreclose radical political challenge through the imposition of a priori sanctions on unacceptable modes of action. In this light, the resort to coercion represents not just a bid [END PAGE 43] to be included in an established democratic order, but rather a challenge to the very parameters of the reasonable order itself. From the perspective of emancipatory power struggles, then, there is arguably a 'serious incompleteness' in the deliberative model of politics because it cannot really incorporate radical democratic challenge and transformative action within the limits of its linguistic universalism. As John Medearis puts it: 'What is at stake is the structure of major institutions and social relations (not just deliberative forums), their distribution of power (not just deliberative chances and capacities), and broad inclusion on equal terms in political contention (not just in deliberation)' (2005: 69). Habermas and other deliberative thinkers fail to sustain a moment of reflexive awareness with regard to their own idealizing presuppositions, with the consequence that discourse ethics can only be maintained as a universal norm by repressing thought about its own social and economic conditions of possibility.

The idea of social suffering stands as a challenge to the imperialism of the universal that arises from the separation of fact from norm, from the unhitching of formal models of democracy from the underlying context of power struggles between unequal groups in which they are always ineluctably situated (Medearis 2005: 71). No theory - the problem is not limited to ideas of deliberation - can hope to set up an a priori, universal model of democracy whose inclusiveness vis-a-vis radical political challenge is perpetually guaranteed. Universal norms - procedural or otherwise - cannot be asserted once and for all lest they become a closed theoretical paradigm that is more concerned with maintaining its own internal integrity than responding to concrete struggles. Conceptual closure is, as we shall see in subsequent chapters, a risk inherent even in radical theories that claim to install a sensitivity to power and struggle at the heart of their models of democracy but, in fact, finish by privileging certain ways of conducting politics and marginalizing others that may be fundamental to emancipatory change.

#### “What’s” of plan’s mask “who’s” of politics---distributional debate is a mask for meta-level questions of representation. Framework is frame-setting---determining “what the aff can say” is argumentative gerrymandering that shields presumed injustice from the very terrain of discourse. Meta-injustices are boxed out through declaring it’s not what we are debating---That’s Fraser. Topical version and switch side arguments presume establishing a just frame when our argument is framing cannot be just.

Nancy Fraser 05. Henry A. and Louise Loeb Professor of Political and Social Science and professor of philosophy at The New School. “Reframing Justice in a Globalizing World, NLR 36, November–December 2005.” New Left Review. https://newleftreview-org.proxy.library.emory.edu/issues/ii36/articles/nancy-fraser-reframing-justice-in-a-globalizing-world

The politics of framing can take two distinct forms, both of which are now being practised in our globalizing world.footnote12 The first approach, which I shall call the affirmative politics of framing, contests the boundaries of existing frames while accepting the Westphalian grammar of frame-setting. In this politics, those who claim to suffer injustices of misframing seek to redraw the boundaries of existing territorial states or in some cases to create new ones. But they still assume that the territorial state is the appropriate unit within which to pose and resolve disputes about justice. For them, injustices of misframing are not a function of the general principle according to which the Westphalian order partitions political space. They arise, rather, as a result of the faulty way in which that principle has been applied. Thus, those who practise the affirmative politics of framing accept that the principle of state-territoriality is the proper basis for constituting the ‘who’ of justice. They agree, in other words, that what makes a given collection of individuals into fellow subjects of justice is their shared residence on the territory of a modern state and/or their shared membership in the political community that corresponds to such a state. Thus, far from challenging the underlying grammar of the Westphalian order, those who practise the affirmative politics of framing accept its state-territorial principle.

Precisely that principle is contested, however, in a second version of the politics of framing, which I shall call the transformative approach. For its proponents, the state-territorial principle no longer affords an adequate basis for determining the ‘who’ of justice in every case. They concede, of course, that that principle remains relevant for many purposes; thus, supporters of transformation do not propose to eliminate state-territoriality entirely. But they contend that its grammar is out of synch with the structural causes of many injustices in a globalizing world, which are not territorial in character. Examples include the financial markets, ‘offshore factories’, investment regimes and governance structures of the global economy, which determine who works for a wage and who does not; the information networks of global media and cybertechnology, which determine who is included in the circuits of communicative power and who is not; and the bio-politics of climate, disease, drugs, weapons and biotechnology, which determine who will live long and who will die young. In these matters, so fundamental to human well-being, the forces that perpetrate injustice belong not to ‘the space of places’, but to ‘the space of flows’.footnote13 Not locatable within the jurisdiction of any actual or conceivable territorial state, they cannot be made answerable to claims of justice that are framed in terms of the state-territorial principle. In their case, so the argument goes, to invoke the state-territorial principle to determine the frame is itself to commit an injustice. By partitioning political space along territorial lines, this principle insulates extra- and non-territorial powers from the reach of justice. In a globalizing world, therefore, it is less likely to serve as a remedy for misframing than as a means of inflicting or perpetuating it.

## Prolif DA

#### The LIO is doomed---backlash and technology destroy the foundations of order

Walter Russell Mead 21. James Clarke Chace Professor of Foreign Affairs and the Humanities at Bard College, the Global View columnist at The Wall Street Journal, and a Distinguished Fellow at the Hudson Institute. "The End of the Wilsonian Era". Foreign Affairs. https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2020-12-08/end-wilsonian-era

This task was complicated by the Cold War, but “the free world” (as Americans then called the noncommunist countries) continued to develop along Wilsonian lines. Inevitable compromises, such as U.S. support for ruthless dictators and military rulers in many parts of the world, were seen as regrettable necessities imposed by the need to fight the much greater evil of Soviet communism. When the Berlin Wall fell, in 1989, it seemed that the opportunity for a Wilsonian world order had finally come. The former Soviet empire could be reconstructed along Wilsonian lines, and the West could embrace Wilsonian principles more consistently now that the Soviet threat had disappeared. Self-determination, the rule of law between and within countries, liberal economics, and the protection of human rights: the “new world order” that both the George H. W. Bush and the Clinton administrations worked to create was very much in the Wilsonian mold.

Today, however, the most important fact in world politics is that this noble effort has failed. The next stage in world history will not unfold along Wilsonian lines. The nations of the earth will continue to seek some kind of political order, because they must. And human rights activists and others will continue to work toward their goals. But the dream of a universal order, grounded in law, that secures peace between countries and democracy inside them will figure less and less in the work of world leaders.

To state this truth is not to welcome it. There are many advantages to a Wilsonian world order, even when that order is partial and incomplete. Many analysts, some associated with the presidential campaign of former U.S. Vice President Joe Biden, think they can put Humpty Dumpty together again. One wishes them every success. But the centrifugal forces tearing at the Wilsonian order are so deeply rooted in the nature of the contemporary world that not even the end of the Trump era can revive the Wilsonian project in its most ambitious form. Although Wilsonian ideals will not disappear and there will be a continuing influence of Wilsonian thought on U.S. foreign policies, the halcyon days of the post–Cold War era, when American presidents organized their foreign policies around the principles of liberal internationalism, are unlikely to return anytime soon.

THE ORDER OF THINGS

Wilsonianism is only one version of a rules-based world order among many. The Westphalian system, which emerged in Europe after the Thirty Years’ War ended in 1648, and the Congress system, which arose in the wake of the Napoleonic Wars of the early nineteenth century, were both rules-based and even law-based; some of the foundational ideas of international law date from those eras. And the Holy Roman Empire—a transnational collection of territories that stretched from France into modern-day Poland and from Hamburg to Milan—was an international system that foreshadowed the European Union, with highly complex rules governing everything from trade to sovereign inheritance among princely houses.

As for human rights, by the early twentieth century, the pre-Wilsonian European system had been moving for a century in the direction of putting egregious violations of human rights onto the international agenda. Then, as now, it was chiefly weak countries whose oppressive behavior attracted the most attention. The genocidal murder of Ottoman Christian minorities at the hands of Ottoman troops and irregular forces in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries received substantially more attention than atrocities carried out around the same time by Russian forces against rebellious Muslim peoples in the Caucasus. No delegation of European powers came to Washington to discuss the treatment of Native Americans or to make representations concerning the status of African Americans. Nevertheless, the pre-Wilsonian European order had moved significantly in the direction of elevating human rights to the level of diplomacy.

Wilson, therefore, was not introducing the ideas of world order and human rights to a collection of previously anarchic states and unenlightened polities. Rather, his quest was to reform an existing international order whose defects had been conclusively demonstrated by the horrors of World War I. In the pre-Wilsonian order, established dynastic rulers were generally regarded as legitimate, and interventions such as the 1849 Russian invasion of Hungary, which restored Habsburg rule, were considered lawful. Except in the most glaring instances, states were more or less free to treat their citizens or subjects as they wished, and although governments were expected to observe the accepted principles of public international law, no supranational body was charged with the enforcement of these standards. The preservation of the balance of power was invoked as a goal to guide states; war, although regrettable, was seen as a legitimate element of the system. From Wilson’s standpoint, these were fatal flaws that made future conflagrations inevitable. To redress them, he sought to build an order in which states would accept enforceable legal restrictions on their behavior at home and their international conduct.

That never quite materialized, but until recent years, the U.S.-led postwar order resembled Wilson’s vision in important respects. And, it should be noted, that vision is not equally dead everywhere. Although Wilson was an American, his view of world order was first and foremost developed as a method for managing international politics in Europe, and it is in Europe where Wilson’s ideas have had their greatest success and where their prospects continue to look strongest. His ideas were treated with bitter and cynical contempt by most European statesmen when he first proposed them, but they later became the fundamental basis of the European order, enshrined in the laws and practices of the EU. Arguably, no ruler since Charlemagne has made as deep an impression on the European political order as the much-mocked Presbyterian from the Shenandoah Valley.

THE ARC OF HISTORY

Beyond Europe, the prospects for the Wilsonian order are bleak. The reasons behind its demise, however, are different from what many assume. Critics of the Wilsonian approach to foreign affairs often decry what they see as its idealism. In fact, as Wilson demonstrated during the negotiations over the Treaty of Versailles, he was perfectly capable of the most cynical realpolitik when it suited him. The real problem of Wilsonianism is not a naive faith in good intentions but a simplistic view of the historical process, especially when it comes to the impact of technological progress on human social order. Wilson’s problem was not that he was a prig but that he was a Whig.

Like early-twentieth-century progressives generally and many American intellectuals to this day, Wilson was a liberal determinist of the Anglo-Saxon school; he shared the optimism of what the scholar Herbert Butterfield called “the Whig historians,” the Victorian-era British thinkers who saw human history as a narrative of inexorable progress and betterment. Wilson believed that the so-called ordered liberty that characterized the Anglo-American countries had opened a path to permanent prosperity and peace. This belief represents a sort of Anglo-Saxon Hegelianism and holds that the mix of free markets, free government, and the rule of law that developed in the United Kingdom and the United States is inevitably transforming the rest of the world—and that as this process continues, the world will slowly and for the most part voluntarily converge on the values that made the Anglo-Saxon world as wealthy, attractive, and free as it has become.

Wilson was the devout son of a minister, deeply steeped in Calvinist teachings about predestination and the utter sovereignty of God, and he believed that the arc of progress was fated. The future would fulfill biblical prophecies of a coming millennium: a thousand-year reign of peace and prosperity before the final consummation of human existence, when a returning Christ would unite heaven and earth. (Today’s Wilsonians have given this determinism a secular twist: in their eyes, liberalism will rule the future and bring humanity to “the end of history” as a result of human nature rather than divine purpose.)

Wilson believed that the defeat of imperial Germany in World War I and the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian, Russian, and Ottoman empires meant that the hour of a universal League of Nations had finally arrived. In 1945, American leaders ranging from Eleanor Roosevelt and Henry Wallace on the left to Wendell Willkie and Thomas Dewey on the right would interpret the fall of Germany and Japan in much the same way. In the early 1990s, leading U.S. foreign policymakers and commentators saw the fall of the Soviet Union through the same deterministic prism: as a signal that the time had come for a truly global and truly liberal world order. On all three occasions, Wilsonian order builders seemed to be in sight of their goal. But each time, like Ulysses, they were blown off course by contrary winds.

TECHNICAL DIFFICULTIES

Today, those winds are gaining strength. Anyone hoping to reinvigorate the flagging Wilsonian project must contend with a number of obstacles. The most obvious is the return of ideology-fueled geopolitics. China, Russia, and a number of smaller powers aligned with them—Iran, for example—correctly see Wilsonian ideals as a deadly threat to their domestic arrangements. Earlier in the post–Cold War period, U.S. primacy was so thorough that those countries attempted to downplay or disguise their opposition to the prevailing pro-democracy consensus. Beginning in U.S. President Barack Obama’s second term, however, and continuing through the Trump era, they have become less inhibited. Seeing Wilsonianism as a cover for American and, to some degree, EU ambitions, Beijing and Moscow have grown increasingly bold about contesting Wilsonian ideas and initiatives inside international institutions such as the UN and on the ground in places from Syria to the South China Sea.

These powers’ opposition to the Wilsonian order is corrosive in several ways. It raises the risks and costs for Wilsonian powers to intervene in conflicts beyond their own borders. Consider, for example, how Iranian and Russian support for the Assad regime in Syria has helped prevent the United States and European countries from getting more directly involved in that country’s civil war. The presence of great powers in the anti-Wilsonian coalition also provides shelter and assistance to smaller powers that otherwise might not choose to resist the status quo. Finally, the membership of countries such as China and Russia in international institutions makes it more difficult for those institutions to operate in support of Wilsonian norms: take, for example, Chinese and Russian vetoes in the UN Security Council, the election of anti-Wilsonian representatives to various UN bodies, and the opposition by countries such as Hungary and Poland to EU measures intended to promote the rule of law.

Meanwhile, the torrent of technological innovation and change known as “the information revolution” creates obstacles for Wilsonian goals within countries and in the international system. The irony is that Wilsonians often believe that technological progress will make the world more governable and politics more rational—even if it also adds to the danger of war by making it so much more destructive. Wilson himself believed just that, as did the postwar order builders and the liberals who sought to extend the U.S.-led order after the Cold War. Each time, however, this faith in technological change was misplaced. As seen most recently with the rise of the Internet, although new technologies often contribute to the spread of liberal ideas and practices, they can also undermine democratic systems and aid authoritarian regimes.

Today, as new technologies disrupt entire industries, and as social media upends the news media and election campaigning, politics is becoming more turbulent and polarized in many countries. That makes the victory of populist and antiestablishment candidates from both the left and the right more likely in many places. It also makes it harder for national leaders to pursue the compromises that international cooperation inevitably requires and increases the chances that incoming governments will refuse to be bound by the acts of their predece

ssors.

The information revolution is destabilizing international life in other ways that make it harder for rules-based international institutions to cope. Take, for example, the issue of arms control, a central concern of Wilsonian foreign policy since World War I and one that grew even more important following the development of nuclear weapons. Wilsonians prioritize arms control not just because nuclear warfare could destroy the human race but also because, even if unused, nuclear weapons or their equivalent put the Wilsonian dream of a completely rules-based, law-bound international order out of reach. Weapons of mass destruction guarantee exactly the kind of state sovereignty that Wilsonians think is incompatible with humanity’s long-term security. One cannot easily stage a humanitarian intervention against a nuclear power.

The fight against proliferation has had its successes, and the spread of nuclear weapons has been delayed—but it has not stopped, and the fight is getting harder over time. In the 1940s, it took the world’s richest nation and a consortium of leading scientists to assemble the first nuclear weapon. Today, second- and third-rate scientific establishments in low-income countries can manage the feat. That does not mean that the fight against proliferation should be abandoned. It is merely a reminder that not all diseases have cures.

What is more, the technological progress that underlies the information revolution significantly exacerbates the problem of arms control. The development of cyberweapons and the potential of biological agents to inflict strategic damage on adversaries—graphically demonstrated by the COVID-19 pandemic—serve as warnings that new tools of warfare will be significantly more difficult to monitor or control than nuclear technology. Effective arms control in these fields may well not be possible. The science is changing too quickly, the research behind them is too hard to detect, and too many of the key technologies cannot be banned outright because they also have beneficial civilian applications.

In addition, economic incentives that did not exist in the Cold War are now pushing arms races in new fields. Nuclear weapons and long-range missile technology were extremely expensive and brought few benefits to the civilian economy. Biological and technological research, by contrast, are critical for any country or company that hopes to remain competitive in the twenty-first century. An uncontrollable, multipolar arms race across a range of cutting-edge technologies is on the horizon, and it will undercut hopes for a revived Wilsonian order.

IT’S NOT FOR EVERYBODY

One of the central assumptions behind the quest for a Wilsonian order is the belief that as countries develop, they become more similar to already developed countries and will eventually converge on the liberal capitalist model that shapes North America and western Europe. The Wilsonian project requires a high degree of convergence to succeed; the member states of a Wilsonian order must be democratic, and they must be willing and able to conduct their international relations within liberal multilateral institutions.

At least for the medium term, the belief in convergence can no longer be sustained. Today, China, India, Russia, and Turkey all seem less likely to converge on liberal democracy than they did in 1990. These countries and many others have developed economically and technologically not in order to become more like the West but rather to achieve a deeper independence from the West and to pursue civilizational and political goals of their own.

In truth, Wilsonianism is a particularly European solution to a particularly European set of problems. Since the fall of the Roman Empire, Europe has been divided into peer and near-peer competitors. War was the constant condition of Europe for much of its history, and Europe’s global dominance in the nineteenth century and early twentieth century can be attributed in no small part to the long contest for supremacy between France and the United Kingdom, which promoted developments in finance, state organization, industrial techniques, and the art of war that made European states fierce and ferocious competitors.

With the specter of great-power war constantly hanging over them, European states developed a more intricate system of diplomacy and international politics than did countries in other parts of the world. Well-developed international institutions and doctrines of legitimacy existed in Europe well before Wilson sailed across the Atlantic to pitch the League of Nations, which was in essence an upgraded version of preexisting European forms of international governance. Although it would take another devastating world war to ensure that Germany, as well as its Western neighbors, would adhere to the rules of a new system, Europe was already prepared for the establishment of a Wilsonian order.

But Europe’s experience has not been the global norm. Although China has been periodically invaded by nomads, and there were periods in its history when several independent Chinese states struggled for power, China has been a single entity for most of its history. The idea of a single legitimate state with no true international peers is as deeply embedded in the political culture of China as the idea of a multistate system grounded in mutual recognition is embedded in that of Europe. There have been clashes among Chinese, Japanese, and Koreans, but until the late nineteenth century, interstate conflict was rare.

In human history as a whole, enduring civilizational states seem more typical than the European pattern of rivalry among peer states. Early modern India was dominated by the Mughal Empire. Between the sixteenth century and the nineteenth century, the Ottoman and Persian Empires dominated what is now known as the Middle East. And the Incas and the Aztecs knew no true rivals in their regions. War seems universal or nearly so among human cultures, but the European pattern, in which an escalating cycle of war forced a mobilization and the development of technological, political, and bureaucratic resources to ensure the survival of the state, does not seem to have characterized international life in the rest of the world.

For states and peoples in much of the world, the problem of modern history that needed to be solved was not the recurrence of great-power conflict. The problem, instead, was figuring out how to drive European powers away, which involved a wrenching cultural and economic adjustment in order to harness natural and industrial resources. Europe’s internecine quarrels struck non-Europeans not as an existential civilizational challenge to be solved but as a welcome opportunity to achieve independence.

Postcolonial and non-Western states often joined international institutions as a way to recover and enhance their sovereignty, not to surrender it, and their chief interest in international law was to protect weak states from strong ones, not to limit the power of national leaders to consolidate their authority. Unlike their European counterparts, these states did not have formative political experiences of tyrannical regimes suppressing dissent and drafting helpless populations into the service of colonial conquest. Their experiences, instead, involved a humiliating consciousness of the inability of local authorities and elites to protect their subjects and citizens from the arrogant actions and decrees of foreign powers. After colonialism formally ended and nascent countries began to assert control over their new territories, the classic problems of governance in the postcolonial world remained weak states and compromised sovereignty.

Even within Europe, differences in historical experiences help explain varying levels of commitment to Wilsonian ideals. Countries such as France, Germany, Italy, and the Netherlands came to the EU understanding that they could meet their basic national goals only by pooling their sovereignty. For many former Warsaw Pact members, however, the motive for joining Western clubs such as the EU and NATO was to regain their lost sovereignty. They did not share the feelings of guilt and remorse over the colonial past—and, in Germany, over the Holocaust—that led many in western Europe to embrace the idea of a new approach to international affairs, and they felt no qualms about taking full advantage of the privileges of EU and NATO membership without feeling in any way bound by those organizations’ stated tenets, which many regarded as hypocritical boilerplate.

EXPERT TEXPERT

The recent rise of populist movements across the West has revealed another danger to the Wilsonian project. If the United States could elect Donald Trump as president in 2016, what might it do in the future? What might the electorates in other important countries do? And if the Wilsonian order has become so controversial in the West, what are its prospects in the rest of the world?

Wilson lived in an era when democratic governance faced problems that many feared were insurmountable. The Industrial Revolution had divided American society, creating unprecedented levels of inequality. Titanic corporations and trusts had acquired immense political power and were quite selfishly exploiting that power to resist all challenges to their economic interests. At that time, the richest man in the United States, John D. Rockefeller, had a fortune greater than the annual budget of the federal government. By contrast, in 2020, the wealthiest American, Jeff Bezos, had a net worth equal to about three percent of budgeted federal expenditures.

Yet from the standpoint of Wilson and his fellow progressives, the solution to these problems could not be simply to vest power in the voters. At the time, most Americans still had an eighth-grade education or less, and a wave of migration from Europe had filled the country’s burgeoning cities with millions of voters who could not speak English, were often illiterate, and routinely voted for corrupt urban machine politicians.

The progressives’ answer to this problem was to support the creation of an apolitical expert class of managers and administrators. The progressives sought to build an administrative state that would curb the excessive power of the rich and redress the moral and political deficiencies of the poor. (Prohibition was an important part of Wilson’s electoral program, and during World War I and afterward, he moved aggressively to arrest and in some cases deport socialists and other radicals.) Through measures such as improved education, strict limits on immigration, and eugenic birth-control policies, the progressives hoped to create better-educated and more responsible voters who would reliably support the technocratic state.

A century later, elements of this progressive thinking remain critical to Wilsonian governance in the United States and elsewhere, but public support is less readily forthcoming than in the past. The Internet and social media have undermined respect for all forms of expertise. Ordinary citizens today are significantly better educated and feel less need to rely on expert guidance. And events including the U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003, the 2008 financial crisis, and the inept government responses during the 2020 pandemic have seriously reduced confidence in experts and technocrats, whom many people have come to see as forming a nefarious “deep state.”

International institutions face an even greater crisis of confidence. Voters skeptical of the value of technocratic rule by fellow citizens are even more skeptical of foreign technocrats with suspiciously cosmopolitan views. Just as the inhabitants of European colonial territories preferred home rule (even when badly administered) to rule by colonial civil servants (even when competent), many people in the West and in the postcolonial world are likely to reject even the best-intentioned plans of global institutions.

Meanwhile, in developed countries, problems such as the loss of manufacturing jobs, the stagnation or decline of wages, persistent poverty among minority groups, and the opioid epidemic have resisted technocratic solutions. And when it comes to international challenges such as climate change and mass migration, there is little evidence that the cumbersome institutions of global governance and the quarrelsome countries that run them will produce the kind of cheap, elegant solutions that could inspire public trust.

WHAT IT MEANS FOR BIDEN

For all these reasons, the movement away from the Wilsonian order is likely to continue, and world politics will increasingly be carried out along non-Wilsonian and in some cases even anti-Wilsonian lines. Institutions such as NATO, the UN, and the World Trade Organization may well survive (bureaucratic tenacity should never be discounted), but they will be less able and perhaps less willing to fulfill even their original purposes, much less take on new challenges. Meanwhile, the international order will increasingly be shaped by states that are on diverging paths. This does not mean an inevitable future of civilizational clashes, but it does mean that global institutions will have to accommodate a much wider range of views and values than they have in the past.

There is hope that many of the gains of the Wilsonian order can be preserved and perhaps in a few areas even extended. But fixating on past glories will not help develop the ideas and policies needed in an increasingly dangerous time. Non-Wilsonian orders have existed both in Europe and in other parts of the world in the past, and the nations of the world will likely need to draw on these examples as they seek to cobble together some kind of framework for stability and, if possible, peace under contemporary conditions.

For U.S. policymakers, the developing crisis of the Wilsonian order worldwide presents vexing problems that are likely to preoccupy presidential administrations for decades to come. One problem is that many career officials and powerful voices in Congress, civil society organizations, and the press deeply believe not only that a Wilsonian foreign policy is a good and useful thing for the United States but also that it is the only path to peace and security and even to the survival of civilization and humanity. They will continue to fight for their cause, conducting trench warfare inside the bureaucracy and employing congressional oversight powers and steady leaks to sympathetic press outlets to keep the flame alive.

Those factions will be hemmed in by the fact that any internationalist coalition in American foreign policy must rely to a significant degree on Wilsonian voters. But a generation of overreach and poor political judgment has significantly reduced the credibility of Wilsonian ideas among the American electorate. Neither President George W. Bush’s nation-building disaster in Iraq nor Obama’s humanitarian-intervention fiasco in Libya struck most Americans as successful, and there is little public enthusiasm for democracy building abroad.
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#### Foreign policy and deterrence is a disaster under Biden.

MEDEA BENJAMIN 22. Co-founder of CODEPINK for Peace, the author of "Inside Iran: The Real History and Politics of the Islamic Republic of Iran" and "Kingdom of the Unjust: Behind the U.S.-Saudi Connection, with NICOLAS J.S. DAVIES, 1/20/22. “After a year of Joe Biden, how come we still have Donald Trump's foreign policy?” https://www.salon.com/2022/01/20/after-a-year-of-joe-biden-how-come-we-still-have-donald-foreign-policy/

Joe Biden and the Democrats were highly critical of Donald Trump's foreign policy, so it was reasonable to expect that Biden would quickly remedy its worst impacts. As a senior member of the Obama administration, Biden surely needed no schooling on Obama's diplomatic agreements with Cuba and Iran, both of which began to resolve longstanding foreign policy problems and provided models for the renewed emphasis on diplomacy that Biden was promising.

Tragically for America and the world, Biden has failed to restore Obama's progressive initiatives, and has instead doubled down on many of Trump's most dangerous and destabilizing policies. It is especially ironic and sad that a president who ran so stridently on being different from Trump has been so reluctant to reverse his regressive policies. Now the Democrats' failure to deliver on their promises with respect to both domestic and foreign policy is undermining their prospects in November's midterm election.

Here is our assessment of Biden's handling of 10 critical foreign policy issues:

1. Prolonging the agony of the people of Afghanistan. It is perhaps symptomatic of Biden's foreign policy problems that the signal achievement of his first year in office was an initiative launched by Trump, to withdraw the U.S. from its 20-year war in Afghanistan. But Biden's implementation of this policy was tainted by the same failure to understand Afghanistan that doomed and dogged at least three prior administrations and the hostile military occupation for 20 years, leading to the speedy restoration of the Taliban government and the televised chaos of the U.S. withdrawal.

Now, instead of helping the Afghan people recover from two decades of U.S.-inflicted destruction, Biden has seized $9.4 billion in Afghan foreign currency reserves, while the people of Afghanistan suffer through a desperate humanitarian crisis. It is hard

to imagine how even Donald Trump could be more cruel or vindictive.

2. Provoking a crisis with Russia over Ukraine. Biden's first year in office is ending with a dangerous escalation of tensions at the Russia/Ukraine border, a situation that threatens to devolve into a military conflict between the world's two most heavily armed nuclear states. The U.S. bears much responsibility for this crisis by supporting the violent overthrow of the elected government of Ukraine in 2014, backing NATO expansion right up to Russia's border, and arming and training Ukrainian forces.

Biden's failure to acknowledge Russia's legitimate security concerns has led to the present impasse, and Cold Warriors within his administration are threatening Russia instead of proposing concrete measures to de-escalate the situation.

3. Escalating Cold War tensions and a dangerous arms race with China. President Trump launched a tariff war with China that economically damaged both countries, and reignited a dangerous Cold War and arms race with China and Russia to justify an ever-increasing U.S. military budget.

After a decade of unprecedented U.S. military spending and aggressive military expansion under George W. Bush and Obama, the U.S. "pivot to Asia" militarily encircled China, forcing it to invest in more robust defense forces and advanced weapons. Trump, in turn, used China's strengthened defenses as a pretext for further increases in U.S. military spending, launching a new arms race that has raised the existential risk of nuclear war to a new level.

Biden has only exacerbated these dangerous international tensions. Alongside the risk of war, his aggressive policies toward China have led to an ominous rise in hate crimes against Asian Americans, and created obstacles to much-needed cooperation with China to address climate change, the pandemic and other global problems.

4. Abandoning Obama's nuclear agreement with Iran. After Obama's sanctions against Iran utterly failed to force it to halt its civilian nuclear program, he finally took a progressive, diplomatic approach, which led to the JCPOA nuclear agreement in 2015. Iran scrupulously met all its obligations under the treaty, but Trump withdrew the U.S. from the agreement in 2018. Trump's withdrawal was vigorously condemned by Democrats, including candidate Biden, and Sen. Bernie Sanders promised to rejoin the JCPOA on his first day in office if he became president.

Instead of immediately rejoining an agreement that worked for all parties, the Biden administration thought it could pressure Iran to negotiate a "better deal." Exasperated Iranians instead elected a more conservative government and Iran moved forward on enhancing its nuclear program.

A year later, and after eight rounds of shuttle diplomacy in Vienna, Biden has still not rejoined the agreement. Ending his first year in the White House with the threat of another Middle East war is enough to give Biden an "F" in diplomacy.

Want a daily wrap-up of all the news and commentary Salon has to offer? Subscribe to our morning newsletter, Crash Course.

5. Backing Big Pharma over a People's Vaccine. Biden took office as the first COVID vaccines were being approved and rolled out across the U.S. and the world. Severe inequities in global vaccine distribution between rich and poor countries were immediately apparent and became known as "vaccine apartheid."

Instead of manufacturing and distributing vaccines on a nonprofit basis to tackle the pandemic as the global public health crisis that it is, the U.S. and other Western countries have chosen to maintain the neoliberal regime of patents and corporate monopolies on vaccine manufacture and distribution. The failure to open up the manufacture and distribution of vaccines to poorer countries gave the COVID virus free rein to spread and mutate, leading to new global waves of infection and death from the delta and omicron variants.

Biden belatedly agreed to support a patent waiver for COVID vaccines under World Trade Organization (WTO) rules, but with no real plan for a "People's Vaccine," Biden's concession has made no impact on millions of preventable deaths.

6. Ensuring catastrophic global warming at COP26 in Glasgow. After Trump stubbornly ignored the climate crisis for four years, environmentalists were encouraged when Biden used his first days in office to rejoin the Paris climate accord and cancel the Keystone XL Pipeline.

But by the time Biden got to Glasgow, he had let the centerpiece of his own climate plan, the Clean Energy Performance Program (CEPP), be stripped out of the Build Back Better bill in Congress at the behest of fossil-fuel industry sock puppet Joe Manchin, turning the U.S. pledge of a 50% cut from 2005 emissions by 2030 into an empty promise.

Biden's speech in Glasgow highlighted China and Russia's failures, neglecting to mention that the U.S. has higher emissions per capita than either of them. Even as COP26 was taking place, the Biden administration infuriated activists by putting oil and gas leases up for auction for 730,000 acres of the American West and 80 million acres in the Gulf of Mexico. At the one-year mark, Biden has talked the talk, but when it comes to confronting Big Oil, he is not walking the walk, and the whole world is paying the price.

7. Political prosecutions of Julian Assange, Daniel Hale and Guantánamo torture victims. Under Biden, the United States remains a country where the systematic killing of civilians and other war crimes go unpunished, while whistleblowers who muster the courage to expose these horrific crimes to the public are prosecuted and jailed as political prisoners.

In July 2021, former drone pilot Daniel Hale was sentenced to 45 months in prison for exposing the killing of civilians in America's drone wars. WikiLeaks publisher Julian Assange still languishes in Belmarsh Prison in England, after 11 years fighting extradition to the United States for exposing U.S. war crimes.

Twenty years after the U.S. set up an illegal concentration camp at Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, to imprison 779 mostly innocent people kidnapped around the world, 39 prisoners remain there in illegal, extrajudicial detention. Despite promises to close this sordid chapter of U.S. history, the prison is still functioning and Biden is allowing the Pentagon to actually build a new closed courtroom at Guantanamo to more easily keep the workings of this gulag hidden from public scrutiny.

8. Economic siege warfare against the people of Cuba, Venezuela and other countries. Trump unilaterally rolled back Obama's reforms on Cuba and recognized unelected Juan Guaidó as the "president" of Venezuela, as the U.S. tightened the screws on its economy with "maximum pressure" sanctions.

Biden has continued Trump's failed economic siege warfare against countries that resist U.S. imperial dictates, inflicting endless pain on their people without seriously imperiling, let alone bringing down, their governments. Brutal U.S. sanctions and efforts at regime change have universally failed for decades, serving mainly to undermine the U.S. claim to democratic and human rights credentials.

Guaidó is now the least popular opposition figure in Venezuela, and genuine grassroots movements opposed to U.S. intervention are bringing popular democratic and socialist governments to power across Latin America, in Bolivia, Peru, Chile and Honduras — and maybe Brazil in 2022.

9. Still supporting Saudi Arabia's war in Yemen, and its repressive ruler. Under Trump, Democrats and a minority of Republicans in Congress gradually built a bipartisan majority that voted to withdraw from the Saudi-led coalition attacking Yemen and to stop sending arms to Saudi Arabia. Trump vetoed their efforts, but the Democratic election victory in 2020 should have led to an end to the war and humanitarian crisis in Yemen.

Instead, Biden only issued an order to stop selling "offensive" weapons to Saudi Arabia, without clearly defining that term, and went on to OK a $650 million weapons sale. The U.S. still supports the Saudi war, even as the resulting humanitarian crisis kills thousands of Yemeni children. And despite Biden's pledge to treat the Saudis' cruel leader, Crown Prince Mohammad bin Salman, as a pariah, Biden refused to even sanction MBS for his barbaric murder of Washington Post journalist Jamal Khashoggi.

10. Still complicit in illegal Israeli occupation, settlements and war crimes. The U.S. is Israel's largest arms supplier, and Israel is the world's largest recipient of U.S. military aid (approximately $4 billion annually), despite its illegal occupation of Palestine, widely condemned war crimes in Gaza and illegal settlement building. U.S. military aid and arms sales to Israel clearly violate the U.S. Leahy Laws and Arms Export Control Act.

Donald Trump was flagrant in his disdain for Palestinian rights, including transferring the U.S. embassy from Tel Aviv to a property in Jerusalem that is only partly within Israel's internationally recognized borders, a move that infuriated Palestinians and drew international condemnation.

But nothing has changed under Biden. The U.S. position on Israel and Palestine is as illegitimate and contradictory as ever, and the U.S. embassy remains on illegally occupied land. In May, Biden supported the latest Israeli assault on Gaza, which killed 256 Palestinians, half of them civilians, including 66 children.

Conclusion

Each part of this foreign policy fiasco costs human lives and creates regional, even global, instability. In every case, progressive alternative policies are readily available. The only thing lacking is political will and independence from corrupt vested interests.

The U.S. has squandered unprecedented wealth, global goodwill and a historic position of international leadership to pursue unattainable imperial ambitions, using military force and other forms of violence and coercion in flagrant violation of the UN Charter and international law.

As a presidential candidate, Biden promised to restore America's position of global leadership, but as president he has instead doubled down on the policies through which the U.S. lost that position in the first place, under a succession of Republican and Democratic administrations. Trump was only the latest iteration in America's race to the bottom.

Biden has wasted a vital year doubling down on Trump's failed policies. In the coming year, we hope that the public will remind Biden of its deep-seated aversion to war and that he will respond, however reluctantly, by adopting more rational ways.
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#### The aff is grammatically prior---the poor are portioned from justice and global economic structure is insulated---only post-Westphalian representation solves.

Nancy Fraser 05. Henry A. and Louise Loeb Professor of Political and Social Science and professor of philosophy at The New School. “Reframing Justice in a Globalizing World, NLR 36, November–December 2005.” New Left Review. https://newleftreview-org.proxy.library.emory.edu/issues/ii36/articles/nancy-fraser-reframing-justice-in-a-globalizing-world

It is the misframing form of misrepresentation that globalization has recently begun to make visible. Earlier, in the heyday of the postwar welfare state, with the Keynesian-Westphalian frame securely in place, the principal concern in thinking about justice was distribution. Later, with the rise of the new social movements and multiculturalism, the centre of gravity shifted to recognition. In both cases, the modern territorial state was assumed by default. As a result, the political dimension of justice was relegated to the margins. Where it did emerge, it took the ordinary-political form of contests over the decision rules internal to the polity, whose boundaries were taken for granted. Thus, claims for gender quotas and multicultural rights sought to remove political obstacles to participatory parity for those who were already included in principle in the political community. Taking for granted the Keynesian-Westphalian frame, they did not call into question the assumption that the appropriate unit of justice was the territorial state.

Today, in contrast, globalization has put the question of the frame squarely on the political agenda. Increasingly subject to contestation, the Keynesian-Westphalian frame is now considered by many to be a major vehicle of injustice, as it partitions political space in ways that block many who are poor and despised from challenging the forces that oppress them. Channelling their claims into the domestic political spaces of relatively powerless, if not wholly failed, states, this frame insulates offshore powers from critique and control.footnote10 Among those shielded from the reach of justice are more powerful predator states and transnational private powers, including foreign investors and creditors, international currency speculators, and transnational corporations. Also protected are the governance structures of the global economy, which set exploitative terms of interaction and then exempt them from democratic control. Finally, the Keynesian-Westphalian frame is self-insulating; the architecture of the interstate system protects the very partitioning of political space that it institutionalizes, effectively excluding transnational democratic decision-making on issues of justice.

From this perspective, the Keynesian-Westphalian frame is a powerful instrument of injustice, which gerrymanders political space at the expense of the poor and despised. For those persons who are denied the chance to press transnational first-order claims, struggles against maldistribution and misrecognition cannot proceed, let alone succeed, unless they are joined with struggles against misframing. It is not surprising, therefore, that some consider misframing the defining injustice of a globalizing age. Under these conditions, the political dimension of justice is hard to ignore. Insofar as globalization is politicizing the question of the frame, it is also making visible an aspect of the grammar of justice that was often neglected in the previous period. It is now apparent that no claim for justice can avoid presupposing some notion of representation, implicit or explicit, insofar as none can avoid assuming a frame. Thus, representation is always already inherent in all claims for redistribution and recognition. The political dimension is implicit in, indeed required by, the grammar of the concept of justice. Thus, no redistribution or recognition without representation.footnote11
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#### Only the aff solves global capital.

Nancy Fraser 12. Henry A. and Louise Loeb Professor of Political and Social Science and professor of philosophy at The New School. Can society be commodities all the way down? Polanyian reflections on capitalist crisis. 2012. ffhalshs-00725060f

Today, moreover, as many on the Left have long warned, and as Greeks have discovered to their dismay, the construction of Europe as an economic and monetary union, without corresponding political and fiscal integration, simply disables the protective capacities of member states without creating broader, European-level protective capacities to take up the slack. But that is not all. Absent global financial regulation, even very wealthy, free-standing countries find their efforts at national social protection stymied by global market forces, including transnational corporations, international currency speculators, financiers, and large institutional investors. The globalization of finance requires a new, post-westphalian way of imagining the arenas and agents of social protection. It requires arenas in which the circle of those entitled to protection matches the circle of those subject to risk; and it requires agents whose protective capacities and regulatory powers are sufficiently robust and broad to effectively rein in transnational private powers and to pacify global finance.

#### It turns their “antitrust good” arguments.

Sanjukta Paul 20, assistant Professor of Law at Wayne State Law School, “Antitrust As Allocator of Coordination Rights,” UCLA Law Review, Vol. 67, No. 2, 2020, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3337861

INTRODUCTION

The central function of antitrust law is to allocate economic coordination rights. This means that private decisions to engage in economic coordination are always subject to public approval, which antitrust law grants either expressly or tacitly. Currently, its methods for accomplishing this function have the effect of anointing control and concentrated power as the preferred form of economic coordination, and to frown upon forms of economic coordination in which power and decisionmaking are more broadly dispersed. Antitrust law’s current methods for allocating coordination rights include what I call its firm exemption, as well as its preference for vertical over horizontal coordination beyond firm boundaries. Antitrust’s methods of allocating coordination rights are ultimately indigenous, and cannot be explained away by external referents: neither by other areas of law, nor by putatively neutral conclusions of social science. They are also historically contingent, and have shifted over time.

Practically speaking, the reigning antitrust paradigm authorizes large, powerful firms as the primary mechanisms of economic and market coordination, while largely undermining others: from workers’ organizations to small business cooperation to democratic regulation of markets. While deploying the legal concept of competition to undermine disfavored forms of economic coordination, antitrust law also quietly underwrites certain major exceptions to principles of competition, notably, the business firm itself. In surfacing the firm exemption, this Article also isolates the underlying, largely unexamined decision criteria for allocating coordination rights that it employes.

The current paradigm for thinking and decisionmaking within antitrust law has a professed commitment to implementing the insights of neoclassical economic theory in legal decisionmaking.1 According to that framework, the aggregate of individual market transactions, rather than direct coordination, will result in an optimal allocation of society’s resources. But this process of market allocation, which the law is supposed to facilitate but not displace, itself has no existence independent of prior legal allocations of economic coordination rights. Those coordination rights are shaped by numerous areas of law—from property to corporate law to labor law to antitrust, among others. This Article focuses on antitrust law, where this function is rarely acknowledged. Although the law and economics paradigm has enormous institutional sticking power in current antitrust law, the basic purposes and methods of antitrust law are also up for debate today in a way that they have not been in decades. Recent contributions to the antitrust revival have emphasized the law’s traditional concerns with corporate power and fairness, which were largely written out of antitrust law in the Chicago School revolution. 2 Dissenting voices asserted these as legitimate antitrust concerns even prior to the current challenge. 3 Mirroring the reformist call to put some limits upon the broad coordination rights of the powerful, a growing chorus of scholarship has emphasized the need to expand the coordination rights of small players to some extent or another, beginning with the question of workers and microenterprises caught between labor and antitrust regulation.4

However, proposals to reform antitrust, or to reconceptualize it, have thus far generally stopped short of questioning the basic premise that its primary function is to promote competition. At least officially, if increasingly uneasily, competition is still king. To be sure, many posit that antitrust performs this stated function badly, or does not perform it at all in certain markets.5 Even when reintroducing values such as fairness and deconcentrating power, for the most part the reform camp has characterized those values as flowing from—or at least coextensive with—promoting or protecting competition. Thus, the political debate over antitrust has been characterized by all sides claiming the idea of competition and

defining what it means to promote competition in different ways.

In the current moment of paradigm instability,6 this Article aims to serve a clarifying role. Defenders of Chicago School antitrust tend to view reformers’ concerns—for example, fairness or deconcentrating corporate power—are extraneous to the fundamental function of antitrust law. That view, however, relies upon the idea that the function of antitrust law is to promote competition and that the law does so by following the independent guidance of economics. But neither of these things is true. Antitrust law decides where competition will be required and where coordination will be permitted. And in accomplishing that task, its most fundamental judgments are not ultimately derived from a neutral external referent, such as economic theory. Meanwhile, as the opposition to antitrust’s targeting of small players’ economic cooperation builds, some have begun to respond that this opposition evinces an inconsistency within the antitrust reform program, which otherwise generally favors increased antitrust enforcement. But, again, this objection only makes sense if one assumes that antitrust’s purpose is to promote competition, full stop. By showing that antitrust in fact already allocates coordination rights, I also show that a conscious reallocation would not constitute a special exemption from a general principle. Instead, it would simply be a different allocation of coordination rights, requiring justification no more and no less than the current one. By reframing antitrust law as this Article does, we can clarify what we are actually debating: what criteria should antitrust law use to allocate economic coordination rights? What forms of economic coordination should it permit or even promote, and what forms of economic coordination should it discourage or even prohibit?

Part I of the Article sets out the doctrinal and logical argument that a core function of antitrust law is to allocate economic coordination rights, that its disfavor of horizontal coordination beyond firm boundaries is an example of this function, and that this function cannot be reduced to the operation of other areas of law. Part II then shows how antitrust’s firm exemption, as embodied in Supreme Court case law, involves the concentration of economic coordination rights—a preference that is mirrored in other aspects of antitrust doctrine as well.

Part III briefly describes how these criteria for allocating coordination rights—preferring control over cooperation, and naturalizing the coordination embodied in hierarchically organized business firms— resulted from a historically contingent process within the development of antitrust law itself. Part IV addresses the contention that this allocation of coordination rights can be rationalized and justified by reference to economic theory, focusing on a now-foundational argument articulated by Robert Bork.

I. ANTITRUST LAW’S OVERALL ALLOCATION OF ECONOMIC COORDINATION RIGHTS

Antitrust law’s core function is to allocate coordination rights to some economic actors and deny them to others. This makes private decisions to engage in economic coordination subject to public approval, which antitrust law grants either expressly or tacitly. Importantly, this reframing is an analytic claim that redescribes existing reality; it is not a normative claim about what antitrust law ought to do. That said, reframing antitrust law this way renders visible economic coordination that has been naturalized and invites us to consider anew forms of economic coordination that have been presumed illegitimate. Ultimately, transparency about antitrust law’s core function should lead to transparency in performing it—that is, in articulating and defending the criteria by which coordination rights are allocated. Currently, those criteria are often obscure and implicit; where they are acknowledged at all, they are often presumed, incorrectly, to be derived from the independent conclusions of social science.

Economic coordination is always either authorized by antitrust law, or not. For any given instance of economic coordination, and certainly for any instance of economic coordination implicating prices, antitrust asks—either explicitly or implicitly—whether that coordination is justified, and then answers that question one way or the other. Moreover, the answers that antitrust gives to these questions are not derivable from property, contract, or corporate law—though its answers interact with each of these.

Currently, antitrust law tends to allocate coordination rights, across doctrinal areas, according to criteria that systematically prefer concentrated control over dispersed coordination or cooperation. If we envision antitrust’s approach to allocating economic coordination rights as a three-legged stool, its conception of the firm is one leg. The other two are its treatment of horizontal coordination beyond firm boundaries and its treatment of vertical coordination beyond firm boundaries. In deciding how to evaluate interfirm coordination, antitrust law first decides whether that coordination is horizontal (between competitor firms in the same market) or vertical(between firms in adjacent markets, such as supplier or distributor relationships). Antitrust law’s stark preference for coordination accomplished through vertical contracting over horizontal interfirm coordination mirrors the criteria according to which the firm exemption itself is applied. Both preferences embody the preference for control over cooperation, which is to say, for the concentration of economic coordination in fewer rather in many hands. This Article focuses primarily on the firm exemption because it is the most obscure of the three legs, and because both vertical interfirm coordination and horizontal coordination beyond firm boundaries are dealt with in greater detail in other work.7 For context, I briefly summarize the doctrinal content of the other two legs of the stool, and their relationship to the firm exemption. I also briefly describe the role of the Chicago School revolution in establishing this overall allocation of coordination rights, although this Article does not provide an exhaustive account of historical origins or etiology of current doctrine.8

A. Horizontal and Vertical Interfirm Coordination

Horizontal coordination beyond firm boundaries—including between individuals—has become increasingly disfavored in antitrust law over time, while vertical interfirm coordination has come increasingly into favor. Together, these tendencies represent the same preference for control over dispersed coordination that is embodied in the firm exemption itself. Moreover, the disfavor of horizontal interfirm coordination adds to the significance of the firm exemption by allocating certain coordination rights uniquely to firms.

I do not claim that a single school or influence within antitrust law is, by itself, responsible for this overall allocation of coordination rights: the legs of the stool have been built with a variety of materials over an extended time. Yet the Chicago School revolution in antitrust analysis has played an important role in creating or intensifying several aspects of antitrust’s current approach to allocating coordination rights, and some background on its influence is therefore warranted.

The Chicago School influence helped to construct antitrust’s attitude to both horizontal and vertical interfirm coordination in a few ways. First, it intentionally cleared away specific normative benchmarks in older antitrust analysis—notably, conceptions of fair business conduct,the flourishing of small enterprise, and attention to the influence of disparities in economic power upon the polity—that would have provided counterweights to other legal criteria. Second, the Chicago School elevated and intensified the focus upon the ideal competitive order as the unitary normative framework for antitrust analysis; that framework implies that horizontal interfirm coordination has inherently distorting effects. Third, the Chicago School specifically argued for relaxing antitrust scrutiny of vertical interfirm coordination.

#### Anti-trust is capitalist---competition inevitably replicates corporate power.

Richard Wolff 19 Professor Emeritus of Economics at University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Transcript from YouTube video: “Economic Update: Competition and Monopoly in Capitalism.” Democracy @ Work. December 9th, 2019. https://www.democracyatwork.info/eu\_competition\_monopoly\_in\_capitalism.

Today I'm going to devote the program to something many of you have asked me to present, to talk about, to analyze, and that is the question of monopoly. It has to do with the assertions we hear often these days that somehow our capitalist system, here in the United States and beyond, is being negatively affected because monopolies have replaced or displaced competition. The idea here is if only we can get competition back, recreate a competitive capitalism, why then the problems we face will go away. Today's program is a design to show you how and why that is not the case, to think about these things in a different way from this nice story that capitalism is basically fine; it's just the monopoly form we have to get rid of so we get back to the competition which we're all supposed to believe is wonderful and presents us with no problems to solve. So let's go, and let's do it in a systematic way.

First, it is of course easier, faced with a declining capitalism, a capitalism that's all around us with its extreme inequalities, with its instabilities – here we are, trying to cope with the effects of the Great Crash of 2008, even while we anticipate the next downturn coming down the road soon – an economic system that has shown (that is, capitalism) that it is not respectful of the natural environment; it is not, as the words now go, sustainable in a reasonable way. Yeah, we're surrounded by problems of capitalism. So it's comforting in that situation to get the idea from somewhere that this really isn't a problem of capitalism as a system but rather the problem brought in somehow from the outside – monopoly – a situation in which competition among many companies gives way in some way we're not quite sure about to a domination by one or a small handful of companies. And so the argument goes, we don't have to be critical of capitalism; we don't have to think about an alternative system. No, no, we just have to deal with this little detail, the monopoly problem. And if we can deal with that, well, we'll get back to a competition, to a competitive capitalism that is good.

There are three big mistakes involved in this way of thinking, which is nonetheless very widespread and very popular, more so now than in quite some years. First mistake: Capitalism has been wrestling with the problem of monopoly from day one. We have had repeated periods of monopoly. They have eventually led to movements, often of many people, to destroy or remove monopoly. We used to call that in America trust-busting, or antitrust. We even have a department within the Department of Justice in Washington devoted to antitrust activities. Yeah, we've been waging battles against monopoly over and over again, and you know why? Because we keep having monopolies over and over again. Google is a monopoly. Amazon is a monopoly. They're all around us: companies that have effectively no real competition. This is a problem that capitalism has always displayed. And that ought to lead you to wonder whether thinking about it as something we can do away with isn't maybe the best possible example of wishful thinking.

The second big mistake is to imagine that competition is some unmixed blessing. It never was, and it isn't today. A competitive market is a human institution. Like every other human institution, it has strengths, and flaws, and weaknesses. To think of competition as some magical perfection is a silly abnegation of your own rational capability to evaluate something. It's sort of advertising thinking. By that, I mean the advertiser tells you what's good about the product they've been told to advertise; they don't tell you what's bad about it. If you want to evaluate it, you don't talk to an advertiser because they only give you one side. The people who promote competition use advertising logic. We're not going to do that here. Competition is no unmixed blessing.

And finally, I'm going to show you that competition is itself the major cause of monopoly. So that even if we ever got back to a competitive capitalism, all that would mean is we're back in the process that produces monopoly – as it always has.

All right, so let's begin. I'm going to start with explaining how competition has all kinds of consequences that most of you, like me, don't like, don't want. It's a discussion, if you like, of competition's other side: you know, the part that the advertiser doesn't tell you about. The used-car salesman who wants you to buy that junk doesn't tell you about what happened last week in the car crash that that was part of, etc., etc.

All right, let's begin. One of the major reasons that American corporations shut down their operations in the United States and moved them to China, among other places, is because of – you guessed it – competition. They wanted to make more money than they had been before. They were afraid of other companies beating them in the competitive game, so they said wow, let's go to China, because there you can pay workers a lot less. There you don't have the same rules to obey. There they don't care that much about pollution as they do here. So we can save on all kinds of costs, and that will allow us to undercut our competitors. Yeah, one of the consequences of competition was the exodus of American companies to other parts of the world, and the enormous unemployment that resulted from it. Yeah, that was a result, among other things, of competition.

Here's another one: Capitalists, employers, seeking to compete with one another, often engage in what we call automation. They bring in machines that are cheaper to use than human laborers, and that gets them a step ahead of their competitors. Okay, if we replace people with machines, we throw those people out of work. That has an impact on them, their self-esteem, their relationship to their spouse, their relationship to their children, their relationship to alcohol – should I continue? What are the social costs of automation? They're huge. They've been documented over and over again. Competition provokes and produces automation.

Let me give you another example: Companies are competing, say, in the food business – you know, trying to get a customer like you or me to buy this kind of cereal rather than another. So they get their labs to go to work, and they discover we can replace wheat, which we used to put in our little flakes, with – Lord help us – some chemical that is cheaper than wheat. We're not going to worry about what that chemical does to your chemistry in your body because we can now lower the price of our cereal, because we're saving on wheat, and undercut the competitor. The human beings who eat this stuff will suffer, now and in the future, but competition left our producer of cereal no choice.

And in case you think I'm making some up, let me give you some concrete ones. The Boeing Corporation, the major producer of airplanes in this country, is in a crisis as a corporation. You know why? Because the 737 Max crashed a couple of times, killing hundreds of people. And you know why? It turns out they economized on safety measures, and training measures. And you know why they did that? Because they're in a very tight competition with European and other airplane manufacturers, and that leads them – as it usually does – to look to cut corners: that race for, quote, "efficiency." Yeah, it was competition that contributed to those deaths and to that problem. That's competition too. You can't whitewash this story; they're real. One of the ways Amazon beats its competition is it speeds up the work process. It has figured out ways to make people work much more intensely, using up their brains, their muscles, their nerves, in ways that cause real long-term physical damage to working people. That, too, is a result of the competitive effort.

And you know, it wasn't so long ago that children were part of the labor force. That's right, kids as young as five and six years of age. We were told they have little fingers, you see. They can be more productive than people who are adults with big fat fingers, you know – that doesn't work. And by the way, you should be grateful because poor kids are the ones we hire, and that gives their poor families more income than they would otherwise have. We heard those arguments. Competition, the companies said, required them to use the more productive, and the lower-wage, children rather than adults. So child labor was also a result of competition. It was so ugly and so troubling to so many people that finally there were movements in the United States and many other countries simply to outlaw child labor. So it became a crime for any employer to use a worker who was under 16 or 18 years of age. That was a way in which people said we are not going to allow competition among capitalists to destroy our children. They were recognizing that competition has an awful effect in what it does to children.

Well, it has many awful effects. So let's be clear: In the history of capitalism, the monopoly problem (which we're going to get to in the second half of today's program) is no worse, it's just different, from the competition problems. Capitalism goes through phases of competition and monopoly, going from one to the other, as I will explain. But we shouldn't bemoan the one in favor of the other, any more than vice-versa. These are neither of them solutions; they are both phases of the problem. And the problem is capitalis

m, which does its number on us both in the period when it's competitive and in the period when it's monopoly. People who want us to engage one more time in an anti-monopoly crusade are doing something that in the end evades the problem, which is the system – capitalism – not this or that form of that system, such as competition and monopoly.

We've come to the end of the first half of today's Economic Update. This gives me an opportunity to remind you, please, to sign up if you haven't already, to subscribe to our YouTube channel. It's a way easily for you to support us, doesn't cost any money, and it is a big help to us in terms of our reputation and what we can accomplish. Likewise, please make use of our websites. They are there for your communication with us. They are there for you to be able to, with a click of a mouse, to follow us on Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. And finally, a special thanks goes, as always, to our Patreon community for their ongoing enthusiastic support. It means the world to us. My final, very final for this first half, is about a new book that we have just produced and released. It's a follow-up to an earlier volume I have spoken to you about that was called Understanding Marxism. For the same reason, we have now produced a brand-new book, just out, called Understanding Socialism. It is a response, as this program is, to issues, questions, comments you have sent to us in large numbers. It's an attempt to give an overview of the different interpretations of what socialism means, of what happened in countries like Russia and China that tried to create this – the strengths, the weaknesses, the lessons to be learned, what to do, and what not to do. Please, if you're interested and want to follow up, check us out, check the book out: lulu.com is how you find both books. And I will be right back; stay with us.

Welcome back, friends, to the second half of today's Economic Update. This program, as I explained, is devoted to the analysis of competition and monopoly as two interactive, sequential phases of capitalism as a system. The first part of the program was devoted mostly to competition, so let's turn now to monopoly. What is the basic definition and criticism of monopoly? Strictly speaking, monopoly is defined simply as a situation in which the producers of a particular commodity – shoes, software programs, haircuts, it doesn't matter – have been reduced to only one. Literally one seller – a monopolist. But in general language, it includes also situations where many producers who once competed with one another have been reduced to only a handful. The strict term for only a handful is "oligopoly," but we don't have to split hairs about this. "Monopoly" will be the word we use for either one or a very small number.

For example, there were once dozens of automobile companies, but very quickly their competition reduced them to basically three for much of the post-World War II period, and you know their names: Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler. And likewise there were once many cigarette producers, there were once many television-set producers, and they became very few, whose names, therefore, we all know.

What's the criticism of a monopoly or oligopoly situation? Again, very simple: The idea is, if there's only one seller of something, that seller can jack up the price way above what he might have otherwise because he doesn't have any competitor. If he had a competitor, if he raised the price, the competitor would get all the business because we'd all go to the competitor who hadn't raised the price rather than buy it at a higher price from the monopolist. So we don't like monopolies, because they can jack up their prices and their profits because they don't have a competitor. And if it's a few, a handful, well then we talk about things like cartels: arrangements when a few get together over dinner, or out on the golf course, and tell us what the price is. If you ever wondered why the prices of different cars, different cigarettes, and so on, are so close to one another – mm-hmm – that's because there are few sellers, and somehow they worked it all out. But the basic criticism is that a monopoly is a situation in which the seller of something jacks the price up way beyond what they could otherwise get because there are no more competitors.

So let's talk about this monopoly problem and where the monopolies come from. Well, the first and most important lesson is this: Competition produces monopoly. It's not something external, imposed on competition. It has nothing to do with human greed or anything else. Are people greedy? You betcha – some more, some less – but that's really a separate matter. It's competition that produces monopoly, and let me show you how that works. In competition, we have, by definition, a whole bunch of producers. They all produce the same thing. They compete with one another, hoping we, the consumer, will buy from one rather than the other. They compete in the quality of what they produce and in the price of what they produce. And we are supposed, as consumers, to go look for the best quality at the lowest price, and to patronize that one who offers that to us better than the others that we could buy from but choose not to.

Okay, that's a fair definition. Now let's follow the logic. Company A produces – however it manages it – a better quality and/or a lower price than Company B. So we all go to Company A. Company B can't find any buyers because it's not competitive. Or to say the same thing in other words, Company A outcompetes Company B. Here's what happens: Company B collapses. Because it can't sell its goods, we're all going to Company A. So Company B sooner or later declares bankruptcy. It can't continue. It lays off its employees, it stops buying inputs, because it can't compete. Good. Now what happens in Company A? Company A says hey, there's a whole bunch of workers that have just lost their job at Company B; they're trained in producing what we produce; let's go hire some of them. And likewise, Company A says, they're not using their computers, or their trucks, or their other inputs. They're going to have to sell them on the secondhand market. We can get some important inputs we need at a lower price than we would have to pay if we bought them new. So what begins to happen is, where before there were two companies, A and B, there's now one larger A, and B has disappeared. Or to say the same thing in simple English, A – the winner in the competitive struggle – eats, absorbs into itself, what's left of Company B.

And this process is repeated over and over, until 30, or 300, companies have become one, or two, or three. That's the result of competition. That's how competition is supposed to work. That's how competition does work. It's important to understand: Monopoly is where competition leads. And as if that weren't enough, let me make sure you understand this from the business point of view: It is the great dream of every entrepreneur to become the last one standing in the competition, to win the competition, not just because it makes you feel good you outmaneuvered your competitors, but because if you're the last one standing, you're the monopolist. The reward for having outcompeted the others is that you're now in a position to jack up the profits, and the prices, way beyond what you could have done before.

So we have a system that produces monopoly, and all the incentives for every entrepreneur in competition to work as hard as possible to become the monopolist. So why is anyone surprised that monopolies keep happening, because they're the whole point and purpose of capitalist competition. If you ever were – and we never have, but if you ever were – able to get rid of all the monopolies and re-establish competition, all you would be doing is setting this same process in motion again for the umpteenth historical time. In other words, fighting against monopoly is pointless as long as you have capitalism, because it is the endless reproducer of this problem – as it always has been.

Now, how do monopolies maintain themselves? If you're the only one standing, you're a monopolist. Or you're an oligopoly, you're a few, and you get together and jack up your prices together. The question becomes look, a monopolist makes very high profits – much higher than a competitor can achieve – and isn't that an enormous incentive for other capitalists to get in on that business? Because look at the profits they're earning, because they're the only one. Apple, Amazon, Google – the profits are staggering. Everybody wants to get in. So the way a monopolist has to think is, I've got to create obstacles that block other people from coming in to get a piece of the enormous profits my monopoly allows me to get. We call that in economics "barriers to entry." Monopolists need to create barriers. Let me give you a couple of examples.

The major soft drink makers in the United States – basically Coca-Cola and Pepsi Cola – they produce a drink that has sugar and coloring in it, and lots and lots of water. Let me assure you, there is nothing difficult or complicated about producing a mixture of sugar, color, and water. It doesn't take a genius; it never did. Pepsi and Coca-Cola make a fortune off of their product, as we know, and they have for decades. They have a virtual monopoly. Now, lots of other people could produce water, sugar, and color close to, if not identical with, whatever they produce, but they can't break through. They can't really get to that status. And you know why? Because Coca-Cola and Pepsi erected a barrier to entry. And the way they did that was with advertising. Every billboard, every magazine cover, every doorway of every institution you've ever been to has a picture of smiling, happy people drinking one or the other. You've learned: that's the drink, that's the drink. Another company might make a perfect substitute, but they can't afford the enormous cost of advertising. The advertising costs more than the water, and the sugar, and the color. What you pay for when you buy Pepsi and Coke is the advertising that got you to buy it. You're paying for being hustled. But it works, because it means other companies know that they can't get in there by cheaply producing an alternative, because you have to produce the advertising that goes with it, or else you can't do it. And so their monopoly is maintained.

Here's another way to maintain a monopoly: Get the government to step in. Here the famous example is the milk producers. Some years ago, there was a crisis with milk. There was contamination; people were getting sick. So the clever milk monopolies came in and said, we're going to support the enormously expensive, special equipment to guarantee pasteurization, and so on, of milk. Why did they support it? Because your small farmer, your small dairy producer, can't afford it, so they go out of business. Only the big, rich few that are left can afford the enormous equipment. They used governmental rules to create a barrier to entry.

Here's another way: corrupt public officials. President Trump denounces Huawei corporation because it compromises our national security. It denounces European car producers because somehow their shipping cars here compromises our security. Who cares? As long as the president blocks other companies from getting into the business that might compete with an American, a barrier to entry exists. Monopolists have been very creative in coming up with ways to preserve their monopolies.

I don't want to lose the basic point. The basic point is: Capitalism oscillates, back and forth between competition and monopoly – first this industry, then that one. For a while, Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler were the monopolies – or the oligopoly, if you like – in automobiles. But eventually, Toyota, and Nissan, and Peugeot, and Fiat broke the monopoly. In that case, it was foreigners who did it. And then we had some competition, and that, then, is now shrinking. The French – the last two producers in France – have just agreed to merge. You get the picture. Industry by industry, first this one, then that one, go through one phase or another.

The important point is: The phases are not our problem. They merge into, and incentivize, each other. Each provokes movement in the other direction. The point to understand is that the problems of a capitalist system are not about this oscillation of phases. We're not going to solve the problem of monopoly by getting rid of them and re-establishing competition. We've been there; we've done that; it reproduces monopoly; and it doesn't change the basic inequality, unsustainability, instability of capitalism. We need to get beyond that stale, old debate – competition versus monopoly – and face the underlying reality: Capitalism is the problem, and getting beyond it is the solution.
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## Framework

#### Comparing “models” is a nationalist tactic---the search for “competitive advantage” universalizes the search for difference.

Pauli Kettunen 11. Professor of Political History in the Social Science Faculty of University of Helsinki. “Welfare Nationalism and Competitive Community.” In Welfare citizenship and welfare nationalism.

Conclusion: the nationalism of models

In conclusion, the concept of “model” deserves some attention. The current discussion on models is inspired by the encounters between globalised capital and national institutions, and it indicates increasing reflexivity as an aspect of globalisation. The popularity of the concept of “the Nordic model” since the 1980s implies such a shift of perspective. Reflexivity is nourished by the imperatives of competitiveness, which include the need for continuous comparisons in order to learn the universal “best practice” or to find the “difference”, i.e. an edge, one’s own particular competitive advantage. European integration has provided an important context for the discussion on models.

An interesting ambiguity appears in the current usage of the concept of model. It may refer to a structure that has become threatened through globalisation, or it may refer to a way of responding to the challenge. The former meaning is obvious in the discussion on the threats against the “Nordic welfare-state model”. The latter, in turn, is manifested in the praising of “the Danish model” of “flexicurity”46, or “the Finnish model” as a paragon of consensual competitiveness in a new knowledge-based society47, or “the Nordic model” in general, assessed to be capable of embracing globalisation by means of risk sharing48. In both cases – the model as a target of threats or the model as a response – globalisation is dealt with as a national challenge. Yet the ambiguity of the concept of model indicates the changing role of the nation state, which can be characterised by the concepts of welfare state and competition state. Instead of a shift from the welfare state to a competition state, the change reflected by the two sides of the concept of the “Nordic model” can be interpreted as a conversion in which welfare-state institutions are modified to serve competition-state functions.

#### 2. Switch side and topical version domesticate difference---eliminates radical potential.

Nicholas C. BURBULES 2K, Professor of Education at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign [“The Limits of Dialogue as a Critical Pedagogy” in *Revolutionary Pedagogies*, ed. by Peter Trifonas, 2000, p.260-262, Accessed Online through Emory Libraries]

The third failing was to conceive difference solely in the sense of categorical diversity. As Homi Bhabha and others argue, cultural difference can be taken in a different way: as a less stable, noncategorical dimension that is a feature of lived [END PAGE 260] experience and identity.19 From this standpoint, differences are enacted. They change over time. They take shape differently in varied contexts. They surpass our attempts to classify or define them. Ellsworth puts it well, that the purpose of dialogue is not just speaking across given positions of difference, but a relation in which those very positions can be (need to be) questioned. Difference, then, is more than a matter of multicultural diversity, of speaking within and across stable identities; it is a challenge to these in three ways, which I have sketched in more recent work as differences within, differences beyond, and differences against. 20 Respectively, these three phrases refer to the ways in which: (1) difference stands not only as an external feature of the “other,” but as an unexplored and unrecognized dimension of one’s self (for example, in the ways by which heterosexuality is defined and defended implicitly as not-homosexual, thereby invoking its “opposite” as a part of its own self-conception); (2) difference exceeds categories of understanding, challenging these in ways that confound conventional vocabularies and assumptions (for example, when racial categories such as “black” and “white” become denaturalized and subject to all sorts of redefinitions, including those of skin color themselves [no one actually has black or white skin], the conflating of racial with national or ethnic differences, the emphasis on hybrid, creole, or border identities, and so on); and (3) difference is defined by its resistance, defined against dominant norms, and its persistent refusal to allow itself to be characterized from dominant, conventional points of view. In each of these three ways difference poses a fundamental challenge to views of dialogue oriented around achieving understanding or agreement— each, in its own way, is a repudiation of convergent models of discourse generally, and each, in its own way, resists the categorical characterization of diversity— no category can possibly contain these sorts of difference.

It is possible to put the point even more strongly: that the effect of traditional views of dialogue has been to “domesticate” difference: to make it safe and comprehensible by regarding all differences as elements of mere variation (diversity), and hence as starting points of potential reconciliation. This is not a neutral standpoint, even as it represents itself as such; it misses deeper, more radical conceptions of difference.

Dialogue as Decontextualized Pedagogy

The crucial shift in perspective outlined here is from a prescriptive model of dialogue as a neutral communicative process, a procedure in which all participants are treated equally, concerned only with the search for knowledge, understanding, and perhaps agreement, to dialogue as a situated practice, one implicated by the particulars of who, when, where, and how the dialogue takes place. The elevation of [END PAGE 261] dialogue as a general pedagogical method abstracts its operations from those particulars and, as noted earlier, treats deviations from that ideal as either illegitimate violations of its rules or as unfortunate shortcomings that can be remedied through the application of more of the same— continuing with dialogue until these failures of understanding or agreement can be remedied. Radical difference, difference that resists accommodation or assimilation, is rendered inexplicable or perverse. But when one examines the who, when, where, and how of dialogue, such characterizations become much more difficult to defend.21

WHO. The first issue begins with the growing diversity of classrooms (at all levels of education) and the increasing awareness of the margins or borders of common school culture as it interacts with the very different values and orientations that students bring to the classroom. The conditions of globalization and mobility have promoted both direct forms of migration across national/cultural categories and (especially with the rise of new communication and information technologies) an increasing proximity and interaction of multiple lines of national/cultural influence. In this context, the central assumptions of common schooling— of a canon of texts, of a shared historical tradition, of a common language— are thrown into question, since even where such elements might be defended, their value and significance are going to be regarded differently from different positions as teachers and students. In some cases they will be directly challenged. The shift to a dialogical approach, in itself, does not remedy these conflicts; and when more radical conceptions of difference are at stake, the very notion of “remedying” such conflicts and disagreements becomes deeply problematic.

A dialogue is not an engagement of two (or more) abstract persons, but of people with characteristics, styles, values, and assumptions that shape the particular ways in which they engage in discourse. Any prescriptive conception of dialogue must confront the challenge of acknowledging persons who do not engage in communication through those forms and who might in fact be excluded or disadvantaged by them. Conversely, an account of dialogue that acknowledges the enormous multiplicity of forms in which people from different cultures do enact pedagogical communicative relations (let alone communicative relations generally) needs to address the question of why some versions are rewarded with the prescriptive label “dialogue” and others are not.