## Security

### at realism

#### No intrinsic drive towards competition- the alt can solve

**Busser 6** [“The Evolution of Security: Revisiting the Human Nature Debate in International Relations”, Mark Busser, Master’s Candidate, Department of Political Science, York University, YCISS Working Paper Number 40, August 2006]

Beyond the problems with the scientific evidence behind Thayer’s ontological claims, there are also problems with his proposed epistemological project of consilience. Using sociobiology to unite the social and natural sciences (and to give bases to a revitalized classical realism) would depend on achieving a near **omnipotence**, where known genetic programs could be weighed against known environmental influence, using science to predict the results. At the outset of his essay, Thayer implies that science is progressing at a rapid pace towards making this a reality. Yet evolutionary explanations for specific behaviours become incredibly problematic given all of the possible factors and externalities which might have affected evolutionary outcomes, all of which are impossible to map into even the most complex mathematical theoretical games. Bell and MacDonald point out that many biologists dispute whether sociobiology can offer useful commentary on humans “because of the central role of culture, language, and self-reflexivity in determining human behaviour.” Similarly, in response to Shaw and Wong, Joshua Goldstein cites evidence that human 5 6 beings do not demonstrate an inherent tendency towards aggression, instead displaying cooperation more often. Goldstein offers the possibility that human behavioural traits like aggression, altruism, and sacrifice are shaped more by cultural transmission than by genes. This possibility enormously complicates the attempt at consilience intended by Thayer and his contemporaries, by adding in incalculable variables that come with social and cultural interactions. 5 7 Because of these complications, Lewontin, Rose, and Kamin have asserted that sociobiology’s grand argument is discredited since **no aspect of human social behaviour has** ever **been linked to a specific gene** or set of genes. As Mary Clark observes, one of the major results of the human genome project was the 5 8 falsification of the supposition that each protein produced in a human cell was coded by a separate gene. In fact, genes often work interdependently, with the same gene recurring along the chromosome and causing different outcomes depending on its position and neighbouring genes. Clark describes the complex signals and activations which occur at the genetic level, concluding that rather than a linear unidirectional blueprint, the **human genome is more like an ecosystem**, and can be responsive to its microscopic – and perhaps even the macroscopic – environment. 5 9 Just how important are the influences culture, social behaviour, and environment to the human condition, as distinct from biological programming? In many caveats and footnotes within Thayer’s own argument, he includes statements that acknowledge the importance of cultural factors in the shaping of modern human societies. If all behaviour cannot be explained by sociobiology and other evolutionary arguments because behaviours are contingent on cultural and environmental factors, how strong is the scientific support for Thayer’s revived realist project? As Bell and MacDonald have suggested, many of the scientific foundations Thayer employs to support his epistemological program are indeterminate because they cannot explain when cultural or environmental factors will play a role. On the ontological side, Thayer certainly comes a long 6 0 way from proving that human nature is defined by and limited to egoism and dominance, as he had intended to do. If knowledge borrowed from evolutionary biology and other natural sciences suggests that culture and environment play a significant role in shaping human behaviours, then it may not be the realist project that is best supported by a deep and sustained interdisciplinary exploration.

#### Expansionary modernization is reactionary to US provocation

Jalil 19 - Research Fellow at the Institute of Strategic Studies Islamabad (Ghazala, <http://issi.org.pk/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/3-SS_Ghazala_Yasmin_Jalil_No-1_2019.pdf>, EM)

While Mearsheimer claims that great powers act aggressively and aim to gain so much power that they are the ultimate hegemons in the system, Waltz’s defensive realism sees the states as acting defensively to maintain rather than upset the balance of power. For Waltz, the states are primarily concerned with maintaining “their position in the system.”55 Defensive realists argue that offence-defence balance favours the defence. 56 Therefore, a robust defence and careful balancing should deter any aggressive impulses from great powers. Defensive realism argues that great powers are concerned with maintaining the status quo rather than maximising their power because often the cost of expansion outweighs the benefits. Defensive realism sees security dilemmas as a problem where an increase in the power of one state increases the insecurity of the other causing the latter to increase its power. Under the conditions of defensive realism, great powers would try to alleviate any security dilemmas rather than exacerbate it. China’s current policy seems to be firmly rooted in defensive realism. Its policy seems to be aimed at maintaining the balance of power rather than upsetting it. As the earlier section has argued, China is not a revisionist power but a status quo one. The analysts like Shiping Tang are convinced that China’s security strategy flows out of its realisation of the security dilemma whereby the Chinese leaders have understood that an aggressive expansionist strategy would just lead to counterbalancing alliances. “This recognition has led China to adopt a defensive realism-rooted security strategy emphasising moderation, self-restraint and security cooperation.”57 Moreover, China’s military modernisation, its Taiwan policy and its increased policies in the South China Sea also make more sense if seen through the lens of defensive realism. China’s Taiwan policy may be more geared towards preventing redistribution of power in the region. Since the US is providing arms assistance to Taiwan, China may be averse to the US aiding Taiwan’s independence ─ the latter issue is one where China has made clear that independence is not acceptable to China. Similarly, there is good evidence that China’s military modernisation programmes and training exercises since the Taiwan Strait Crisis of 1996 are aimed partially at dealing with the issue of the Taiwanese separation.58 On the question of whether China is balancing against the US, Johnston says, “There seems to be little doubt that China’s military modernisation programme since the mid-1990s has been aimed in large measure at developing capabilities to deter or slow the application of the US military power in the region.”59 It would then seem that China is not concerned with gaining power or projecting its powers but with balancing against a predominance of the US power in the region. China has not shown any signs of hegemonic behaviour as a lot of Western analysts feared. Instead of guided by offensive realism, China’s policies seem to be guided by defensive realism where it is concerned with survival and with maintaining its position in the system. Just as the US fears China’s hegemonic rise, China also fears the increase of the US influence in the region and its talk of containing China. China’s policy may change in the future to display hegemonic tendencies. However, at present, there is not much evidence to support the theory of offensive realism.

### AT: de Araujo

#### **De Araujo ev flows neg – it’s not inevitable and the alt can solve**

2AC de Araujo 14 (Marcelo, “Moral Enhancement and Political Realism,” Journal of Evolution and Technology 24(2): 29-43)

The idea of a “structure” should not be understood here in metaphysical terms, as though it mysteriously existed in a transcendent world and had the magical power of determining leaders’ decisions in this world. The word “structure” denotes merely a political arrangement in which there are no powerful law-enforcing institutions. And in the absence of the kind of security that law-enforcing institutions have the force to create, political leaders will often fail to cooperate, and occasionally engage in conflicts and wars, in those areas that are critical to their security and survival. Given the structure of international politics and the basic goal of survival, this is likely to continue to happen, even if, in the future, political leaders become less egoistic and power-seeking through moral enhancement. On the other hand, since the structure of the international system of states is itself another human institution, there is no reason to suppose that it cannot ever be changed. If people become morally enhanced in the future they may possibly feel more strongly motivated to change the structure of the system of states, or perhaps even feel inclined to abolish it altogether. In my view, however, addressing major threats to the survival of humankind in the future by means of bioengineering is unlikely to yield the expected results, so long as moral enhancement is pursued within the present framework of the international system of states.