### T

#### Interp- Restriction means ban

City of Northglenn 11 CHAPTER 11 CITY OF NORTHGLENN ZONING ORDINANCE ARTICLE 5 RULES OF CONSTRUCTION – DEFINITIONS <http://www.northglenn.org/municode/ch11/content_11-5.html>, mmm/uco

Section 11-5-3. Restrictions. As used in this Chapter 11 of the Municipal Code, the term "restriction" shall mean a prohibitive regulation. Any use, activity, operation, building, structure or thing which is the subject of a restriction is prohibited, and no such use, activity, operation, building, structure or thing shall be authorized by any permit or license.

#### Violation- Plan on limits power does not ban it.

1. Voter-

Limits- millions of tinkering affs are possible, only total ban provides a clear limit on the topic

Ground- small limits on presidential power make the topic bidirectional and kill the heart of the topic.

#### T should be evaluated under competing interpretations.

### J

#### The aff must provide justification for human existence

WISEMAN 1999 [Taking a bite out of 'humanity', On Cannibalism in the Pax Americana, Jetlagged News, ACC 2-23-09, <http://www.jetlaggednews.com/number/02-10.31.1999/03.html>,]

Idealists may view this attitude with contempt and see it as an abrogation of some higher responsibility and possibility. But responsibility to whom and possibility of what? This is the problem. While undoubtedly we are 'human' enough to maintain, need, use, and desire of collective identity, there nonetheless is no humanity to speak of (or from), even if many insist that there is. Nor should certain localised concerns/ feelings/moods be mistaken for any universal valuation of human life as such. If God is dead, then so too is the human soul, as are all indicators of what it might mean to be 'human' per se. Human consciousness, in this respect, is only a puzzle and not itself, as some would have it, an indicator of some essentialist human identity.¶ In short, there is no thing, no category by which 'humankind' is humankind above all other qualification. There is only particular and needful association (call it utilitarian if you like, although the term is not quite broad enough to account for the complex array of reasons for human association). There is only in and out; here and there. There is nothing to give unqualified human life universal value. Nothing at all, although this is certainly NOT to preclude locally articulated and very real meanings. To be sure, there remain all kind of conventional meanings in the 'world', as there remain intensely held passions, values, even compassions of all kinds. But none of these are universally transferable.

#### VOTE NEGATIVE. IF THERE IS NO INHERENT REASON TO SAFEGUARD HUMAN LIFE THEN THERE IS NO REASON TO DO THE AFF. AND YOU VOTE NEGATIVE ON PRESUMPTION

### CP

#### THE RHETORIC OF NUCLEAR WINTER TREATS HUMANS AS STERILE STATISTICS THAT ONLY COUNT INSOFAR AS THEY ARE ALIVE OR DEAD – WE MUST REJECT NUCLEAR WINTER DISCOURSE

Howard Veregin (Ph.D., UC-Santa Barbara, Assistant Professor of Geography @ Kent State) February 1994

 [“The Science of Dystopia: A Retrospective on Nuclear Winter Modeling” Professional Geographer, 46(1) p. 10-18, loghry]

Nuclear issues continue to be relevant to the scientific arena as well. Since well before the arrival of the nuclear winter theory, scientists have studied the direct and indirect effects of nuclear weapons on a variety of biological, environmental, and human systems at scales ranging from individual cities to the entire planet (see Veregin 1991 for a review). The lessons that have been learned about the appropriateness and effectiveness of this mode of inquiry have enduring importance. Such re search crosses traditional scientific barriers, not only because it trespasses into the realm of political decision making, but because the is sues it faces reflect an awareness of the immense personal stakes involved in the possibility of large-scale nuclear destruction. Much of this research has as its goal a transformation of public attitudes about nuclear issues and a reorientation of nuclear policies established to guide the management and possible use of nuclear weapons. This goal—to the extent that it has been achieved—hinges on the ability to make nuclear war imaginable and measurable. Studies of the effects of nuclear weapons are in effect metaphorical devices that appeal directly to the basest of human fears (Curry 1986).¶ Nuclear winter modeling is a case in point. The apocalyptic images conjured up by these models are designed to convey a view of the individual as unwilling victim rather than passive spectator, as an agent with immense personal stakes in the issues being addressed (Joenniemi 1987). Curiously, however, the methods brought to bear in nuclear winter modeling are seriously at odds with this objective. These methods, adopted from more traditional modes of scientific endeavor, seem incongruous when juxtaposed with nuclear winter's underlying humanistic concerns. Nuclear winter modeling, wrapped in its cloak of supposed scientific impartiality, represents an attempt to apply rational, objective methods of argument in the context of an issue that, at its basest level, is not rational or objective at all. While the effort may be laudable, its effect is to prevent the underlying issues from being heard above the clatter of the scientific challenge.¶ This incongruity between objectives and methods is apparent in a rereading of the scientific discourse on nuclear winter. The results of nuclear winter models themselves are in a sense irrelevant to the larger meaning of nuclear winter modeling as a subject of scientific study. The enduring legacy of nuclear winter is not so much the countless attempts to narrow the range of uncertainty in environmental damage estimates, but the manner in which scientific endeavor was appropriated as a vehicle for voicing concerns exogenous to the scientific questions themselves. There are numerous dimensions to this process of appropriation. The purpose of this paper is to discuss three main dimensions of this process.¶ (1) The images conjured up by nuclear winter, while apocalyptic, are also dehumanizing due to the use of cold and sterile statistical methods and terminology. While ostensibly serving to heighten public awareness, they actually serve to obscure the human dimensions of the issue.¶ (2) Nuclear winter modeling focuses on the effects of nuclear weapons rather than addressing the root causes of weapons development or challenging the basis of nuclear strategy. Thus strategists have easily eliminated much of the force behind the nuclear winter threat by proposing changes in nuclear forces that minimize the probability of nuclear winter occurring.¶ (3) As a result of high levels of unresolvable uncertainty in nuclear winter modeling, the policy significance of the nuclear winter thesis is ambiguous. Subjective preference and political context are as important in explaining the interpretation of nuclear winter as model results themselves.¶ These dimensions raise serious questions about the efficacy and appropriateness of nuclear winter modeling as a means of changing public attitudes and impacting nuclear policy. The issues raised in this discussion are not restricted to the nuclear winter case, but also apply to other research on the effects of nuclear weapons. The implications for peace and security studies in geography are significant, since analysis of the effects of nuclear weapons is often referred to as an arena in which geography can provide unique and valuable insights (e. g., Cutter 1988; Pepper and Jenkins 1983, 1985). The discussion also has significance for studies of other global environment issues, which is of particular importance given the number of nuclear winter scientists who have gone on to examine such issues. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, there are implications for the notion of scientific objectivity itself, since many of the moral dilemmas faced in nuclear winter modeling cannot be resolved if the roles of affect, ideology, and individual creativity are subverted to the needs of the mainstream scientific paradigm.

#### OUR COUNTER ADVOCACY IS THE ENTIRE AFF MINUS THE NUCLEAR WINTER ARGUMENTS – WE SHOULD JUST ADMIT THAT OUR MOTIVATION FOR CLAIMING NUCLEAR WAR IMPACTS IS THAT NUCLEAR WAR IS THE MOST HORRIBLE THING IMAGINABLE– THE COUNTERPLAN SOLVES THE WHOLE AFF AND AVOIDS DEHUMANIZATION

Howard Veregin (Ph.D., UC-Santa Barbara, Assistant Professor of Geography @ Kent State) February 1994

[“The Science of Dystopia: A Retrospective on Nuclear Winter Modeling” Professional Geographer, 46(1) p. 10-18, loghry]

As a product of modernist scientific endeavor, nuclear winter modeling is posited on the concept of objectivity and the need to produce results that are verifiable and repeatable. These characteristics are reflected in the manner in which scientific endeavor has been appropriated as a vehicle for voicing concerns about the nuclear threat. The various dimensions of this appropriation process discussed above underscore the ineffectiveness of the methods that scientists have brought to bear in studying nuclear winter. These methods, adopted from more conventional scientific inquiry, reflect an attempt to apply rational, objective argument in the context of an issue that is rooted instead in affect, instinct, and morality. In nuclear winter modeling, humanistic concern over the possibility of large-scale anthropogenically induced environmental damage is thrust forward cloaked in the ostensibly neutral and impartial language of science. The net effect is to unintentionally amplify the superficial aspects of the issue while obscuring its underlying importance and significance. Scientists wishing to prevent nuclear war because they find it morally outrageous instead advance an argument that hinges on the level of human and environmental destruction that might result if a nuclear war were ever to occur.¶ Why the attempt to veil the very interests that underlie the modeling effort? Rather than hiding behind the dispassionate cloak of science, why not accept and admit the underlying motivation? Whether or not this occurs, after all, scientists will continue to use their specialized knowledge to voice nonscientific concerns. However, their statements will lack persuasion if forced to conform to a seemingly objective and impartial stance. Rigid adherence to what is conventionally viewed as being within the purview of science serves to artificially constrain the debate. It is forced into narrow, technical areas within which responsibility for isolated pieces of knowledge is delegated to those with the requisite expertise. It is in this context that the most enduring aspects of the nuclear winter debate are revealed. Ironically, the legacy of nuclear winter modeling lies, not in its effects on nuclear policy or public attitudes, but in its implications for scientists who seek to voice personal and humanistic concerns. Ultimately the most interesting questions that nuclear winter raises relate to the purpose and function of science, its relationship to society at large, and its role in purveying specialized knowledge for public and political bodies.

### Security

#### The promise of another, better world is not new, but a continuation of the Socratic delusion which understands this world—the only world we have—as flawed and forever in need of correction. This requires the extirpation and hatred of all those unpredictable and irreducible parts of existence which make life worth living.

Saurette 96 [Paul, School of Political Studies at the University of Ottawa in Canada, “‘I Mistrust all Systematizers and Avoid Them’: Nietzsche, Arendt and the Crisis of the Will to Order in International Relations Theory,” *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 25.1 (1996): 1-28] // myost

According to Nietzsche, the philosophical foundation of a society is the set of ideas which give meaning to the phenomenon of human existence within a given cultural framework. As one manifestation of the Will to Power, this will to meaning fundamentally influences the social and political organisation of a particular community.5 Anything less than a profound historical interrogation of the most basic philosophical foundations of our civilization, then, misconceives the origins of values which we take to be intrinsic and natural. Nietzsche suggests, therefore, that to understand the development of our modern conception of society and politics, we must reconsider the crucial influence of the Platonic formulation of Socratic thought. Nietzsche claims that pre-Socratic Greece based its philosophical justification of life on heroic myths which honoured tragedy and competition. Life was understood as a contest in which both the joyful and ordered (Apollonian) and chaotic and suffering (Dionysian) aspects of life were accepted and affirmed as inescapable aspects of human existence.6 However, this incarnation of the will to power as tragedy weakened, and became unable to sustain meaning in Greek life. Greek myths no longer instilled the self-respect and self-control that had upheld the pre-Socratic social order. 'Everywhere the instincts were in anarchy; everywhere people were but five steps from excess: the monstrum in animo was a universal danger'.7 No longer willing to accept the tragic hardness and self-mastery of pre-Socratic myth, Greek thought yielded to decadence, a search for a new social foundation which would soften the tragedy of life, while still giving meaning to existence. In this context, Socrates' thought became paramount. In the words of Nietzsche, Socrates saw behind his aristocratic Athenians; he grasped that his case, the idiosyncrasy of his case, was no longer exceptional. The same kind of degeneration was everywhere silently preparing itself: the old Athens was coming to an end—And Socrates understood that the world had need of him -his expedient, his cure and his personal art of self-preservation.8 Socrates realised that his search for an ultimate and eternal intellectual standard paralleled the widespread yearning for assurance and stability within society. His expedient, his cure? An alternative will to power. An alternate foundation that promised mastery and control, not through acceptance of the tragic life, but through the disavowal of the instinctual, the contingent, and the problematic. In response to the failing power of its foundational myths, Greece tried to renounce the very experience that had given rise to tragedy by retreating/escaping into the Apollonian world promised by Socratic reason. In Nietzsche's words, '[r]ationality was divined as a saviour . . . it was their last expedient. The fanaticism with which the whole of Greek thought throws itself at rationality betrays a state of emergency: one was in peril, one had only one choice: either to perish, or be absurdly rational . . . . '9 Thus, Socrates codified the wider fear of instability into an intellectual framework. The Socratic Will to Truth is characterised by the attempt to understand and order life rationally by renouncing the Dionysian elements of existence and privileging an idealised Apollonian order. As life is inescapably comprised of both order and disorder, however, the promise of control through Socratic reason is only possible by creating a 'Real World' of eternal and meaningful forms, in opposition to an 'Apparent World' of transitory physical existence. Suffering and contingency is contained within the Apparent World, disparaged, devalued, and ignored in relation to the ideal order of the Real World. Essential to the Socratic Will to Truth, then, is the fundamental contradiction between the experience of Dionysian suffering in the Apparent World and the idealised order of the Real World. According to Nietzsche, this dichotomised model led to the emergence of a uniquely 'modern'10 understanding of life which could only view suffering as the result of the imperfection of the Apparent World. This outlook created a modern notion of responsibility in which the Dionysian elements of life could be understood only as a phenomenon for which someone, or something, is to blame. Nietzsche terms this philosophically-induced condition ressentiment, and argues that it signalled a potential crisis of the Will to Truth by exposing the central contradiction of the Socratic resolution. This contradiction, however, was resolved historically through the aggressive universalisation of the Socratic ideal by Christianity. According to Nietzsche, ascetic Christianity exacerbated the Socratic dichotomisation by employing the Apparent World as the responsible agent against which the ressentiment of life could be turned. Blame for suffering fell on individuals within the Apparent World, precisely because they did not live up to God, the Truth, and the Real World. As Nietzsche wrote, 'I suffer: someone must be to blame for it' thinks every sickly sheep. But his shepherd, the ascetic priest tells him: 'Quite so my sheep! someone must be to blame for it: but you yourself are .this someone, you alone are to blame for yourself,—you alone are to blame for yourself—This is brazen and false enough: but one thing is achieved by it, the direction of ressentiment is altered. 11 Faced with the collapse of the Socratic resolution and the prospect of meaninglessness, once again, 'one was in peril, one had only one choice: either to perish, or be absurdly rational . . . . ' 12 The genius of the ascetic ideal was that it preserved the meaning of the Socratic Will to Power as Will to Truth by extrapolating ad absurdium the Socratic division through the redirection of ressentiment against the Apparent World! Through this redirection, the Real World was transformed from a transcendental world of philosophical escape into a model towards which the Apparent World actively aspired, always blaming its contradictory experiences on its own imperfect knowledge and action. This subtle transformation of the relationship between the dichotomised worlds creates the Will to Order as the defining characteristic of the modern Will to Truth. Unable to accept the Dionysian suffering inherent in the Apparent World, the ascetic ressentiment desperately searches for 'the hypnotic sense of nothingness, the repose of deepest sleep, in short absence of suffering'.13 According to the ascetic model, however, this escape is possible only when the Apparent World perfectly duplicates the Real World. The Will to Order, then, is the aggressive need increasingly to order the Apparent World in line with the precepts of the moral Truth of the Real World. The ressentiment of the Will to Order, therefore, generates two interrelated reactions. First, ressentiment engenders a need actively to mould the Apparent World in accordance with the dictates of the ideal, Apollonian Real World. In order to achieve this, however, the ascetic ideal also asserts that a 'truer', more complete knowledge of the Real World must be established, creating an ever-increasing Will to Truth. This self-perpetuating movement creates an interpretative structure within which everything must be understood and ordered in relation to the ascetic Truth of the Real World. As Nietzsche suggests, [t]he ascetic ideal has a goal—this goal is so universal that all other interests of human existence seem, when compared with it, petty and narrow; it interprets epochs, nations, and men inexorably with a view to this one goal; it permits no other interpretation, no other goal; it rejects, denies, affirms and sanctions solely from the point of view of its interpretation.14 The very structure of the Will to Truth ensures that theoretical investigation must be increasingly ordered, comprehensive, more True, and closer to the perfection of the ideal. At the same time, this understanding of intellectual theory ensures that it creates practices which attempt to impose increasing order in the Apparent World. With this critical transformation, the Will to Order becomes the fundamental philosophical principle of modernity.

#### Their predictions and rush to secure the world produces bureaucratic bungling that creates error replication—the solutions we prescribe make the problems worse

Der Derian 5 [James, Director of the Global Security Program and Research Professor of International Studies at the Watson Institute for International Studies at Brown University, “National Security: An Accident Waiting to Happen,” *Harvard International Review* 27.3 (Fall 2005): 82-83] // myost

It often takes a catastrophe to reveal the illusory beliefs we continue to harbor in national and homeland security. To keep us safe, we place our faith in national borders and guards, bureaucracies and experts, technologies and armies. These and other instruments of national security are empowered and legitimated by the assumption that it falls upon the sovereign country to protect us from the turbulent state of nature and anarchy that permanently lies in wait offshore and over the horizon for the unprepared and inadequately defended. But this parochial fear, posing as a realistic worldview, has recently taken some very hard knocks. Prior to September 11, 2001, national borders were thought to be necessary and sufficient to keep our enemies at bay; upon entry to Baghdad, a virtuous triumphalism and a revolution in military affairs were touted as the best means to bring peace and democracy to the Middle East; and before Hurricane Katrina, emergency preparedness and an intricate system of levees were supposed to keep New Orleans safe and dry. The intractability of disaster, especially its unexpected, unplanned, unprecedented nature, erodes not only the very distinction of the local, national, and global, but, assisted and amplified by an unblinking global media, reveals the contingent and highly interconnected character of life in general. Yet when it comes to dealing with natural and unnatural disasters, we continue to expect (and, in the absence of a credible alternative, understandably so) if not certainty and total safety at least a high level of probability and competence from our national and homeland security experts However, between the mixed metaphors and behind the metaphysical concepts given voice by US Homeland Security Director Michael Chertoff early into the Katrina crisis, there lurks an uneasy recognition that this administration—and perhaps no national government—is up to the task of managing incidents that so rapidly cascade into global events. Indeed, they suggest that our national plans and preparations for the “big one”—a force-five hurricane, terrorist attack, pandemic disease—have become part of the problem, not the solution. His use of hyberbolic terms like “ultracatastrophe” and “fall-out” is telling: such events exceed not only local and national capabilities, but the capacity of conventional language itself. An easy deflection would be to lay the blame on the neoconservative faithful of the first term of US President George W. Bush, who, viewing through an inverted Wilsonian prism the world as they would wish it to be, have now been forced by natural and unnatural disasters to face the world as it really is—and not even the most sophisticated public affairs machine of dissimulations, distortions, and lies can close this gap. However, the discourse of the second Bush term has increasingly returned to the dominant worldview of national security, realism. And if language is, as Nietzsche claimed, a prisonhouse, realism is its supermax penitentiary. Based on linear notions of causality, a correspondence theory of truth, and the materiality of power, how can realism possibly account—let alone prepare or provide remedies—for complex catastrophes, like the toppling of the World Trade Center and attack on the Pentagon by a handful of jihadists armed with box-cutters and a few months of flight-training? A force-five hurricane that might well have begun with the flapping of a butterfly’s wings? A northeast electrical blackout that started with a falling tree limb in Ohio? A possible pandemic triggered by the mutation of an avian virus? How, for instance, are we to measure the immaterial power of the CNN-effect on the first Gulf War, the Al-Jazeera-effect on the Iraq War, or the Nokia-effect on the London terrorist bombings? For events of such complex, non-linear origins and with such tightly-coupled, quantum effects, the national security discourse of realism is simply not up to the task. Worse, what if the “failure of imagination” identified by the 9/11 Commission is built into our national and homeland security systems? What if the reliance on planning for the catastrophe that never came reduced our capability to flexibly respond and improvise for the “ultra-catastrophe” that did? What if worse-case scenarios, simulation training, and disaster exercises—as well as border guards, concrete barriers and earthen levees—not only prove inadequate but might well act as force-multipliers—what organizational theorists identify as “negative synergy” and “cascading effects” —that produce the automated bungling (think Federal Emergency Management Agency) that transform isolated events and singular attacks into global disasters? Just as “normal accidents” are built into new technologies—from the Titanic sinking to the Chernobyl meltdown to the Challenger explosion—we must ask whether “ultracatastrophes” are no longer the exception but now part and parcel of densely networked systems that defy national management; in other words, “planned disasters.”

#### The AFF’s naïve aversion to death is the ultimate form of nihilism, ensuring a valueless existence—rather than seeking to escape death, we should ask first what makes life worth living

Owen & Ridley 0 [David, Head of the Division of Politics & International Relations and Professor of Social & Political Philosophy at the University of Southampton in England, and Aaron, Head of Research in the Department of Philosophy at the University of Southampton, “Dramatis Personae: Nietzsche, Culture, and Human Types,” *Why Nietzsche Still? Reflections on Drama, Culture, and Politics*, ed. Alan D. Schrift, p. 149-151] // myost

The modern condition offers both a threat and a promise. Nietzsche argues that the self-destruction of the ascetic ideal threatens to under-mine our capacities for “self-discipline,” “self-surveillance," and “self-overcoming” and our disposition to truthfulness precisely because we now lack an overarching goal in the service of which these capacities and this disposition are cultivated. But this undermining does not entail any diminution of our dissatisfaction with our this-worldly existence: the suffering endemic to life itself remains; all that has gone is the (ascetic) mode of valuing that rendered such suffering meaningful, and hence bearable. Thus Nietzsche discerns the outlines of a creature whose best capacities have atrophied and whose relationship to its own existence is one of perpetual dissatisfaction. The threat here is obvious: What is to be feared, what has a more calamitous effect than any other calamity, is that man should inspire not profound fear but profound nausea; also not great fear but great pity. Suppose these two were one day to unite, they would inevitably beget one of the uncanniest monsters: the “last will" of man, his will to nothingness, nihilism. And a great deal points to this union. (GM III:14) So suicidal nihilism beckons. The one response to the situation that is absolutely ruled out is the one that has so far proved most successful at addressing problems of this sort, namely, adoption of the ascetic ideal, because the present crisis is caused by the self-destruction of that ideal. But Nietzsche argues that two plausible responses to the crisis are nonetheless possible for modern man. Both of these involve the construction of immanent ideals or goals: one response is represented by the type the Last Man, the other by the type the Ubermensch. The first response recognizes the reality of suffering and our (post-ascetic) inability to accord transcendental significance to it and concludes that the latter provides an overwhelming reason for abolishing the former to whatever extent is possible. This has the effect of elevating the abolition of suffering into a quasi-transcendental goal and brings with it a new table of virtues, on which prudence figures largest. In other words, this response takes the form of a rapport a soi characterized by a style of calculative rationality directed toward the avoidance of suffering at any cost, for example, of utilitarianism and any other account of human subjectivity that accords preeminence to maximizing preference satisfaction. In Thus Spoke Zarathustra Nietzsche portrays this type as follows: "What is love? What is creation? What is longing? What is a star?" thus asks the Last Man and blinks. The earth has become small, and upon it hops the Last Man, who makes everything small. His race is as inexterminable as the flea; the Last Man lives longest." We have discovered happiness," say the List Men and blink. They have left the places where living was hard: for one needs warmth. One still loves one's neighbor and rubs oneself against him: for one needs warmth. Sickness and mistrust count as sins with them: one should go about warily. He is a fool who still stumbles over stones or over men! A little poison now and then: that produces pleasant dreams. And a lot of poison at last, for a pleasant death. They still work, for work is entertainment. But they take care the entertainment does not exhaust them. Nobody grows rich or poor any more: both are too much of a burden. Who still wants to rule? Who obey? Both are too much of a burden. No herdsman and one herd. Everyone wants the same thing, everyone is the same: whoever thinks otherwise goes voluntarily into the madhouse "Formerly all the world was mad," say the most acute of them and blink. They are clever and know everything that has ever happened: so there is no end to their mockery. They still quarrel, but they soon make up—otherwise indigestion would result. They have their little pleasure for the day and their little pleasure for the night: but they respect health. "We have discovered happiness," say the Last Men and blink. (Z:1 "Prologue" 5) Nietzsche’s hostility to this first form of response is evident. His general objection to the Last Man is that the Last Man’s ideal, like the ascetic ideal, is committed to the denial of chance and necessity as integral features of human existence. Whereas the ascetic ideal denies chance and necessity per se so that, while suffering remains real, what is objection-able about it is abolished, the Last Man’s ideal is expressed as the practical imperative to abolish suffering, and hence, a fortiori, what is objectionable about it—that is, our exposure to chance and necessity. This general objection has two specific dimensions. The first is that the Last Man's ideal is unrealizable, insofar as human existence involves ineliminable sources of suffering—not least our consciousness that we come into being by chance and cease to be by necessity. Thus the Last Man's ideal is predicated on a neglect of truthfulness. The second dimension of Nietzsche's objection is that pursuit of the Last Man's ideal impoverishes and arbitrarily restricts our understanding of what we can be and, in doing so, forecloses our future possibilities of becoming otherwise than we are. Thus the Last Man's ideal entails an atrophying of the capacities (for self-overcoming, etc.) bequeathed by the ascetic ideal. Nietzsche brings these two dimensions together in Beyond Good and Evil: "You want, if possible-and there is no more insane ‘if possible’—to abolish suffering. . . . Well-being as you understand it—that is no goal, that seems to us an end, a state that soon makes man ridiculous and contemptible—that makes his destruction desirable" (BGE 225).

#### The alternative is to embrace insecurity.

#### True peace emerges not from state machinations, but only from within. Rather than the life-denying ressentiment which characterizes security politics, we encourage a politics of life-affirmation.

Nietzsche 1880 [Friedrich, philosophizes with a hammer, “Aphorism #284,” *The Wanderer & His Shadow*, 1880, trans. Helen Zimmern, 1908, <http://www.davemckay.co.uk/philosophy/nietzsche/nietzsche.php?name=nietzsche.1878.humanalltoohuman.zimmern.12>] // myost

The means to real peace.— No government admits any more that it keeps an army to satisfy occasionally the desire for conquest. Rather the army is supposed to serve for defense, and one invokes the morality that approves of self-defense. But this implies one’s own morality and the neighbor’s immorality; for the neighbor must be thought of as eager to attack and conquer if our state must think of means of self-defense. Moreover, the reasons we give for requiring an army imply that our neighbor, who denies the desire for conquest just as much as does our own state, and who, for his part, also keeps an army only for reasons of self-defense, is a hypocrite and a cunning criminal who would like nothing better than to overpower a harmless and awkward victim without any fight. Thus all states are now ranged against each other: they presuppose their neighbor’s bad disposition and their own good disposition. This presupposition, however, is inhumane, as bad as war and worse. At bottom, indeed, it is itself the challenge and the cause of wars, because, as I have said, it attributes immorality to the neighbor and thus provokes a hostile disposition and act. We must abjure the doctrine of the army as a means of self-defense just as completely as the desire for conquests. And perhaps the great day will come when people, distinguished by wars and victories and by the highest development of a military order and intelligence, and accustomed to make the heaviest sacrifices for these things, will exclaim of its own free will, “We break the sword," and will smash its entire military establishment down to its lowest foundations. Rendering oneself unarmed when one had been the best-armed, out of a height of feeling—that is the means to real peace, which must always rest on a peace of mind; whereas the so-called armed peace, as it now exists in all countries, is the absence of peace of mind. One trusts neither oneself nor one’s neighbor and, half from hatred, half from fear, does not lay down arms. Rather perish than hate and fear, and twice rather perish than make oneself hated and feared—this must someday become the highest maxim for every single commonwealth. Our liberal representatives, as is well known, lack the time for reflecting on the nature of man: else they would know that they work in vain when they work for a “gradual decrease of the military burden." Rather, only when this kind of need has become greatest will the kind of god be nearest who alone can help here. The tree of war-glory can only be destroyed all at once, by a stroke of lightning: but lightning, as indeed you know, comes from a cloud—and from up high.

## International Norm

#### International norms are not objective but tainted with Eurocentrism

Mutua 1 [Makau, Dean of the University at Buffalo Law School, “Savages, Victims, and Saviors: The Metaphor of Human Rights,” *Harvard International Law Journal* 42.1 (Winter 2001): 201-245] // myost

The first dimension of the prism depicts a savage and evokes images of barbarism. The abominations of the savage are presented as so cruel and unimaginable as to represent their state as a negation of humanity. The human rights story presents the state as the classic savage, an ogre forever bent on the consumption of humans.7 Although savagery in human rights discourse connotes much more than the state, the state is depicted as the operational instrument of savagery. States become savage when they choke off and oust civil society.8 The "good" state controls its demonic proclivities by cleansing itself with, and internalizing, human rights. The "evil" state, on the other hand, expresses itself through an illiberal, anti-democratic, or other authoritarian culture. The redemption or salvation of the state is solely dependent on its submission to human rights norms. The state is the guarantor of human rights; it is also the target and raison d'etre of human rights law.9 But the reality is far more complex. While the metaphor may suggest otherwise, it is not the state per se that is barbaric but the cultural foundation of the state. The state only becomes a vampire when "bad" culture overcomes or disallows the development of "good" culture. The real savage, though, is not the state but a cultural deviation from human rights. That savagery inheres in the theory and practice of the one-party state, military junta, controlled or closed state, theocracy, or even cultural practices such as the one popularly known in the West as female genital mutilation (FGM), 10 not in the state per se. The state itself is a neutral, passive instrumentality-a receptacle or an empty vessel-that conveys savagery by implementing the project of the savage culture. The second dimension of the prism depicts the face and the fact of a victim as well as the essence and the idea of victimhood. A human being whose "dignity and worth" have been violated by the savage is the victim. The victim figure is a powerless, helpless innocent whose naturalist attributes have been negated by the primitive and offensive actions of the state or the cultural foundation of the state. The entire human rights structure is both anticatastrophic and reconstructive. It is anti-catastrophic because it is designed to prevent more calamities through the creation of more victims. It is reconstructive because it seeks to re-engineer the state and the society to reduce the number of victims, as it defines them,11 and prevent conditions that give rise to victims. The classic human rights document-the human rights report--embodies these two mutually reinforcing strategies. An INGO human rights report is usually a catalogue of horrible catastrophes visited on individuals. As a rule, each report also carries a diagnostic epilogue and recommended therapies and remedies.12

#### Their description of South Asian conflict is not neutral but a reflection of historical processes and identity formations—the AFF’s threat construction reproduces an ideology of danger which necessitates violence

Das 10 [Runa, University of Minnesota, “State, Identity and Representations of Nuclear (In)Securities in India and Pakistan,” *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 45.2 (2010): 146-169] // myost

Campbell in his work Writing Security (1992) undertakes an analysis of how the boundaries of the United States’ identity is made secure by manifestly linking American identity to a ‘danger’ (be it the Amerindians, the Communists, or immigrants). In this representation of danger, threat does not merely exist, rather it emerges from certain context-bound judgments made by policy makers where a ‘historical mode of representation’, which self-consciously adopts an imagination of the Self and the Other, is adopted to define danger. In this dynamic of projecting the Self/Other, identity becomes an inescapable dimension of being. It is not fixed by nature but constituted in relation to difference. As Campbell (1992: 8) argues, ‘Whether we are talking of “the body” or “the state”… the identity of each is performatively [read: discursively] constituted’. The constitution of a state’s identity is achieved through the construction of boundaries which serve to demarcate an ‘insider’ from an ‘outsider’, the ‘self’ from the ‘other’, and the ‘domestic’ from the ‘alien’. In this sense, a state, as a sovereign entity in world politics, has no ontological status; but is constituted by a discourse that is ‘tenuously constituted in time … ’ (Campbell, 1992: 9). Thus, ‘states are never finished entities; [since] the tension between the demands of identity and practices that constitute [it] can never be fully revealed’ (Campbell, 1992: 11). In this context, one may raise the following questions. If there are no primary or stable identities then how can International Relations speak about concepts like state, war, security, danger, and sovereignty? After all, is not security determined by the presence of a sovereign state and war conducted in its name before an identifiable anarchy? Questioning the conventional assumption that international relations is in a state of anarchy, critical constructivists view (in)security as what Campbell (1992) calls ‘representations of danger’. For critical constructivists, insecurities rather than natural facts are social and cultural productions; ‘that is, in contrast to the received [conventional] view which treats the objects of insecurity and insecurities … as pre-given or natural … [critical constructivists] treat them as mutually constituted cultural and social constructions … ’ (Weldes et al., 1999: 10). Viewing culture ‘ … as encompassing [a] multiplicity of discourses or “codes of intelligibility” … through which meaning [identity] is produced’, critical constructivists view, ‘ … insecurities [as] cultural in the sense that they are produced in and out of “the context within which people give meanings to their actions and experiences and make sense of their lives” … ’ (Weldes et al., 1999: 1–2). Operating within frameworks of meanings, assumptions, and distinctive social identities, the representation of the Other and what constitutes (in)securities are left open to the dynamics of interpretation, whereby relations of identity/Otherness may be produced, enforced, and reified in a conflicting manner. When construction of identity takes place through such inter-subjective processes of subscribing meanings, then this constructed identity itself becomes a source of insecurity. Thus, an Other is considered threatening not only by the actions that it takes but also by its very constitution through certain discourses or ‘codes of intelligibility’, thereby making (in)securities a cultural construction of danger. Furthermore, countering the conventional security studies conception of the state as a natural fact, the critical constructivists view the state as a cultural entity. This means that by virtue of its identity the state becomes the self/subject that defines security and is simultaneously an object that faces threat from its constructed insecurity. This ‘discursive constitution and interpellation’ of the subject/object position of the state produces a set of state-centric discourses where state officials, leaders, or members of political parties ‘describe to themselves and others the world [as they understand it and] in which they live’ (Weldes et al., 1999: 14). In this sense, states play a privileged role in the production and re-production of reality. By authoritatively defining what they perceive as real, state-centric representations naturalize what are, in fact, self-interested constructions of (in)security such that both their constructed nature and sources of origin are obscured (Weldes et al., 1999). In this sense, states and their (in)securities also represent mutually constitutive entities. The importance of the above perspectives is that they allow us to understand states as paradoxical entities which do not possess pre-existing stable identities. As a consequence, a state is marked by an inherent tension in terms of adjusting to the ‘many axes of [its] nationalist identity’ to represent an imagined community (Campbell, 1992: 11). Central to this process of constituting a state’s identity is its foreign policy and its construction of danger, which serve to consolidate the state’s identity. This is because if a state faces no dangers then it would implicate a movement via stasis and wither away. Accordingly, a state’s security policy by inscribing certain ‘codes of dangers’ helps to contain and reproduce the state’s boundaries, and guarantees for the state an impelling identity. In this sense, ‘the drive to fix a state’s identity from constant re-production of danger(s) cannot absolutely succeed’ (Campbell, 1992: 11). How the drive to ‘fix’ India and Pakistan’s nationalist identities is discursively undertaken by their political leaders by interpreting their national (in)securities on the basis of realpolitik, historical legacies, and developmental anxieties, is undertaken in the rest of my analysis. State Formations in India and Pakistan With the geo-political visions of state formations3 that unfurled in the post-partition era, the idea of India and Pakistan’s shared security as envisaged by Jinnah in the mid-1940s became an illusory concept (Waheed-uz-Zaman, 1969); as was Jinnah’s vision of Pakistan as a secular, democratic state – which ended with his premature death in 1948. A newly born Pakistan (self-identified as an Islamic state) inherited a weak divided Muslim League leadership that neglected democratic government and a military-bureaucratic apparatus that came to control the state’s decision-making. While the bureaucracy governed the state, security policy became the domain of the anti-Indian military. In contrast, India’s civilizational moorings, heightened by its colonial experience, caused India’s post-independent leaders to circumscribe India’s geo-political vision as a strong, sovereign, secular, democratic state – to be pursued through the principles of idealist nationalism. In pursuing this line of strategic thinking known as Nehruvianism, the dominant mode of international relations, that is realpolitik balancing, was forsaken by India in favor of non-alignment. India’s faith in Panchsheel (peaceful co-existence) was a reflection of this ideal. Concomitant with this view of national security through peace was Nehru’s benevolent attitude towards non-Hindus, especially Muslims in India and his reiteration that ‘it was for the Hindus to make the Muslims in India feel at home and not see themselves as second-class citizens’ (Parthasarathi, 1987: 8). This aspect of his perception symbolized the secular ideology of sarvadharma samabhava (equal respect for all religions), which for Nehru, unlike the Hindu nationalist BJP, was an attribute of the modern Indian state. However, as Krishna (1996: 82) explains, geo-political visions go beyond the mere territorial mapping of a country’s boundary, and include ‘representational practices’, which have ‘in various ways attempted to inscribe something called India [or, for that matter, Pakistan] with a content, history, meaning, and trajectory’. This is because the central attribute of nation formation in international politics not only requires the existence of a particular configuration of territorial space, that is ‘territorially disjointed, mutually exclusive, and functionally similar to other sovereign states’, but also requires that this space be constantly ‘guarded, re-made, and re-secured’, by the production of an Other in the international system (Ruggie, 1993: 144). Seen through these complexities of boundary-making, the mapping of India and Pakistan’s geo-political visions (reflective of secular-modernity, Hindutva ideology, and an Islamic identity) have duly constituted the identities of their national selves and in the process have also engaged in certain representational practices to re-articulate their national (in)securities and nuclear policy choices. In the next section, I analyze these representational aspects of India’s nation-making and nuclear policy choices. I offer this analysis in three phases: the Nehru years (1947–1962); the post-Nehru years (1962–1998); and the BJP years (1998–2004). I incorporate how the Indian state has simultaneously drawn from realpolitik, historical legacies, developmental anxieties, and secular/cultural ideologies to shape India’s identity, (in)security, and nuclear policies.

#### Their view of China is driven by racist colonial desire not objective knowledge.

Pan 2012 (Chengxin, Senior Lecturer in International Relations, Deakin University, Australia, Knowledge, Desire and Power in Global Politics, Western Representations of China’s Rise Pg 15-16, Vance)

Yet objective certainty, however desirable or precisely because it is *desirable*, is an illusory effect of desire. The desire for certainty may be satisfied only within desire and through the certainty of desire. When certainty is not within reach, the modern knowing subject, unable or unwilling to give up its quest, turns to the illusive certainty and comfort of what John Dewey called ‘emotional substitute’: ‘in the absence of actual certainty… men cultivated all sorts of things that would give them the *feeling* of certainty’.74 Trust is one such feeling, which is not based on objective certainty, but cultivated through a process of ‘emotional inoculation’.75 Fears and fantasies are two other forms of emotional substitute, especially useful for making sense of strangers. By fantasising about an uncertain other’s assimilability and eventual transformation into the self, one can gain a sense of certainty. Alternatively, one may arrive at a sense of predictability by reducing that other to an already known prototype of menace. Either way, these emotional substitutes provide the much-desired antidote of certainty to the Cartesian Anxiety: either the other can be converted, or it must pose a threat. In this way, the initial uncer-tainty of the other translates into the certainty of an emotive either/or. As emotional substitutes for certainty, fears and fantasies have figured prominently in what Robert Young calls ‘colonial desire’, which regulates colonialists’ encounters with and their knowledge of various unfamiliar Others. These emotions together make up an ‘ambivalent double gesture of repulsion and attraction’ towards the colonised.76 On the one hand, colonial desire finds people of other races and colours ‘disgusting’ and ‘repulsive’, hence an object of fear and paranoia. At the same time, colonial desire projects onto those (same) people some degree of ‘beauty, attractiveness or desirability’,77 thus making them an exotic source of fantasy and wonder. According to Homi Bhabha, underlying such ambivalent structures of feeling is precisely the modern desire for certainty, identity and ‘a pure origin’.78 Thanks to this ever-present modern desire, the aforementioned ambivalent colonial stereotype is able to acquire ‘its currency’ and ‘ensure[s] its repeatability in changing historical and discursive conjunctures’. In this sense, Orientalism is best seen as ‘the site of dreams, images, fantasies, myths, obsessions and requirements’.79 What this latent form of Orientalist knowledge reveals is not something concrete or objective about the Orient, but something about the Orientalists themselves, their recurring, latent desire of fears and fantasies about the Orient. Indeed, only when imbued with such unconscious but persistent desire can Orientalism get ‘passed on silently, without comment, from one text to another’.80 ¶ Western knowledge of China’s rise is precisely such a text that has been caught up in the silent emotive current. For example, the ‘China threat’ paradigm bears the stamp of fears, whereas the ‘China opportunity’ paradigm can be best seen as manifestations of modern fantasies. These emotions about China’s rise are certainly not identical to the Orientalist colonial desire in the nineteenth century. For instance, the overtly sexual/racial connotation that once was a hallmark of old-style colonial desire is no longer prevalent in contemporary writings on China. What used to be some of the main obsessions in European colonial fears and fantasies, such as miscegenation and racial hybridity, have now been repackaged as issues of multiculturalism, norm diffusion, socialisation, and so forth. Still, a similar structure of colonial desire lives on; even the racial facet has not disappeared completely in contemporary China watching.81 Thus, to better understand the twin China paradigms, we need to put them in the context of (neo)colonial desire, and ask how they have more to do with the West’s latent quest for certainty and identity than with the manifest search for empirical truth about ‘Chinese reality’. If all social knowledge is yoked to some intertextuality and worldliness, much of the worldliness of the ‘threat’ and ‘opportunity’ discourses of China is then made up of the (renewed) fears and fantasies accompanying the Western modern desire and self-imagination.

#### **This is an independent reason to vote negativve**

**LIU 2005**

(Henry C.K., Pres. Investment Group, Asia Times, Aug 20, “Trade wars can lead to shooting wars,”

http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Global\_Economy/GH20Dj01.html)

**The fear of China by the US dates back to almost two centuries of racial prejudice,** ever since Western imperialism invaded Asia beginning in the early 19th century. Notwithstanding that it is natural, *ceteris paribus,* that the country with the world's largest population, an ancient culture and long history would again be a big player in the world economy as it modernizes, **the fear that China might soon gain advantages** of labor, capital and even technology **that would allow it to dominate the world economy and gain the strategic advantages that go along with such domination is enough to push the world's only superpower openly to contemplate preemptive strikes against it.** Furthermore, Chinese culture commands close affinity with the peoples of Asia, the main concentration of the world's population and a revived focal point of global geopolitics. Suddenly**, socio-economic Darwinism** of survival of the fittest, **celebrated in the United States since its founding, is no longer welcome by US policymakers when the US is no longer the fittest and the survival of US hegemony is at stake. To many in the US, particularly the militant neoconservatives,international trends of socio-economic Darwinism now need to be stopped by war.**

#### No internal link that solves China – no warrant to China modeling US

#### Deterrence allows debates about nuclear weapons to become depoliticized—leaving us paralyzed by fear

**Fishel in 2008** (Stefanie [Dept of Political Science @ John Hopkins], "Nuclear Collective Memories, Hidden Histories, and Remembering the Future", Paper presented at the annual meeting of the ISA's 49th ANNUAL CONVENTION, BRIDGING MULTIPLE DIVIDES, Hilton San Francisco, SAN FRANCISCO, CA, USA Online, kdf)

Historically, nuclear debates in the United States have centered on the “unspeakability” of nuclear war drawing this silence from the apocalyptic power of nuclear technology. This “unspeakability” is mirrored institutionally and, ultimately this silence leads to depoliticized and sanitized policy paths and political realities. This can manifest itself in greater secrecy in policy decisions concerning nuclear technology and the phenomenon of “nuclear reclusion” in the public realm. Given the undisputed destructive power of nuclear weapons, the US tendency toward depolitization and secrecy short circuits democratic accountability. I will examine two cases toward this end: This paper compares the memorialization of nuclear weapons in Japan and the US. How do our collective memories differ? Can methods of remembering history lead us toward different policies or aid us in creating memories of the future that include open debate and de-sanitized nuclear policy? This paper seeks to analyze how nuclear memory operates within the democratic state, and how we bridge the apparent incongruity with global nuclear realities and the (re)creation of democratically accountable nation-states. Introduction The past isn’t dead and buried. In fact, it isn’t even past.-William Faulkner One of the atomic bomb’s less dramatic after effects is the “atomic cataract.” These are severe radiation cataracts that occurred among the survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki several months to several years after the bombings. Generally dismissed in earlier studies as coincidental or unimportant, later medical studies found the relationship between the radiation exposure and the cataracts as an important piece in understanding long-term effects of radiation. 1 To use this as a particularly appropriate beginning of this essay, I assert that our vision, too, is clouded by our existential vulnerability to nuclear weapons like it was for the hibakusha 2 who were near ground zero of the nuclear explosion. In most nuclear states, the public does not want to dwell on nuclear weapons and the state is happy to let nuclear policy be “born secret” and stay that way. Daniel Deudney calls this phenomenon “nuclear reclusion.” 3 We are both unwilling and unable to see the implications of nuclearism on the whole due to the sublime nature of nuclear weapons.. ¶ **They negate the very conditions of life on Earth and fundamentally question the democratic state’s power to regulate this potentiality**. To add to this, the long-term effects of nuclear weapons and the nuclear policy are only beginning to come to light 63 years after the bombing of Japan and nearly 20 years after the end of the Cold War. **These include both tangible and intangible effects: the monetary cost of creating and maintaining nuclear weapons, the political cost of secrecy, the ecological cost, and the health risks posed by increased radiation due to the detonation of thousands of nuclear weapons during testing, too name but a few. Though not caught in the maelstrom of total war as the inhabitants of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were in 1945, we are nonetheless survivors coming to terms with a world whose great powers acquired the capability to act out total destruction through the power inside the atom.**

## Pakistan

#### The nuclear war that will never come is a political tool that whitewashes objective violence that occurs in the status quo. We should learn to love the bomb to shatter this ideology.

Chaloupka 1992 (William, Professor emeritus of political science at Colorado State, Knowing Nukes, Pg. 131-138, Vance)

It is true that there have been attempts to conjure the end of the world before now. The Oxford English Dictionary recounts that even this word¶ "last" has long had such a connotation. But our finality is different. We¶ know that we've decided to organize our lives under science, and we¶ know that science and technology can touch the entire world, ending it.¶ The bomb takes us completely into the realm of fiction, myth, and unreality.¶ Derrida has made this point quite convincingly. We are constantly¶ told that nuclear war is unthinkable, that it is impossible to contemplate.

But, Derrida argues, nukes are far from "unspeakable." Derrida's breakthrough¶ is his explanation —utterly disconnected from apologies for nuclear¶ managers —that nukes aren't unspeakable, but are, on the contrary,¶ uniquely spoken, or textual. By "textual," he means that the politics of¶ nukes are "literary creations" in a sense that other political questions¶ have never been. Information, communication, codes, and decoding are¶ at the heart of nuclear politics. When we talk, language comes out, and¶ very often those words really do "have a life of their own," as we sometimes¶ say. Try as we might to say "what we really mean," we are speaking¶ a language that has huge inertia. People were speaking it long before we¶ were born. You could even say it "speaks us"; it creates our context, it is¶ the range of possibilities within which we move. All of that is becoming commonplace, at least among intellectuals.¶ More serious is the question of democratic politics. A political culture in¶ which the participants (at least some of them) know the culture exists¶ only in words, anticipation, and image will be quite different from other¶ varieties, in which specific sets of facts and objects have been privileged.

Nuclear war not only is not a fact, it can never be a fact. What is more,¶ this emerging politics is ahistorical —if you are convinced that history provides the basis for the solution of our problems, you will have to deal¶ with the nuke, which escapes history. As Derrida notes, "A nuclear war¶ has not taken place: one can only talk and write about it." Or "Nuclear¶ war has no precedent. It has never occurred, itself; it is a non-event. . . .¶ Some might call it a fable, then, a pure invention: in the sense in which it¶ is said that a myth, an image, a fiction, a Utopia, a rhetorical figure, a¶ fantasy . . . are inventions."2 This fable-like quality —this fabulousness —helps us to understand¶ some aspects of antinuclear politics that might otherwise seem extraordinarily¶ out of place. Many commentators have noted that nukes, of¶ themselves, do not stand out as a risk. Coal damages more lives than do¶ nuclear reactors, even after Chernobyl. Many soldiers and civilians are killed by machine guns and primitive explosives. Chemical and biological warfare is, in some ways, more fearsome than nuclear war. That is to say,¶ there is a disproportion of fears to risks evident in this discourse. Some¶ apologists for the nuke find this disproportion evidence of the looniness¶ of their opponents, but that is too convenient an explanation to be taken¶ seriously. On the other hand, some antinuclear writers point to these extraordinary¶ fears as demonstration of a Jungian Fear, a pattern that¶ traces throughout civilization and history, providing a unity, albeit a negative¶ one.3 This odd situation bespeaks some kind of inarticulate acceptance of¶ the fabulousness of our times. One needs a fiction, a symbolic body, to¶ deal with modern life, in which so much rides on myth and image. If the¶ symbol doesn't exactly fit the "reality," so much the better; that only¶ "proves" there is some stronger power, lurking behind the risk-assessment¶ calculations. When an unquestionably successful president uses Star¶ Wars to quell opponents, then turns out to have been seriously infatuated¶ with astrology, the benefits of hard, technocratic, "true" analyses begin¶ to crumble. The choice of a fictional risk, pressed disproportionately to¶ its "real" references, is a strategic choice, an intervention that polarizes¶ the advocates of reality, exposing their hubris. It is playful. Of course, there are other ways of discussing the demise of the real at¶ the hand of powerful fictions, all of which I have been calling the "end of¶ lastness." I could note the demise of Christianity as a community-wide¶ myth that had power and truth. But the plot is so similar that my additions¶ would simply be redundant. Lastness went south. The idea that at¶ the end of our increment, at the end of our career and life, we would¶ be able to sum up the events and successes and failures, now had a big,¶ glowing hole in it. That's serious. We had learned to comfort ourselves,¶ knowing we would have that last word, at some undefined future point. Someday, we'll look back on this and laugh. That reassurance steadied¶ the keel. Even knowing when that last lecture will be is a problem. No contemporary¶ speaker can presume the Socratic luxury of distance by virtue of¶ old age in the way most speakers have throughout history. The somber,¶ responsible mood of last is a sign that misfires, referring to no privileged¶ perspective or knowledge. Without that sign, Lastness would hardly form¶ a coherent phenomenon. If we took it seriously, there would have to be¶ some joking aside; the mood couldn't hold. There are other ways to analyze this unexpected absence: the disappearance¶ of the last. Social scientists claim to have learned a few things¶ about cataclysmic political change, and one of the things they know very¶ well is that real political change happens when expectations are rising,¶ not when hopes are low. That rule of thumb has been demonstrated, over and over. Those who are actually starving rebel less frequently than those who have seen how to end their hunger, or those who expected hunger to¶ end when it did not. This analytical rule corresponds very well with our¶ commonsense politics; a critique must be accompanied by a proposal.¶ Naysaying changes nothing, as the saying goes.But neither political science nor common sense is notably effective in¶ the face of the nuke. A massive exercise in self-delusion will be necessary to raise expectations, putting not only the problem but also the solution into the realm of the fictional. This is not a partisan insight; if you happen¶ to take deterrence's peace-keeping abilities seriously then its success¶ doesn't raise realistic hopes, either. It simply means that surveillance will¶ be with us forever. Deterrence and nuclearism are now the classic excuse¶ for surveillance. To repeat: whatever the particular political position,¶ party, or ideology, delusion (fiction, metaphor, image) will henceforth be¶ more central to it than facts, objects, and certainties. Reagan's famed¶ vagueness with the "details" and even the broader circumstances of administration¶ is not the "crime against the nature of society" some of his¶ critics seem to think it is. But the qualities of his performance can still be¶ exposed and criticized. Political action can still proceed, even in lieu of higher expectations,¶ objective analysis, or appeal to common consensus based on clear community¶ values. By not recognizing this possibility, liberal antinuclearists¶ have remained wary of some of the styles and attitudes that have, in fact,¶ served them best. The heavily responsible, even dismal, attitude seems¶ necessary; distracted citizens do not "want to know." Indeed, they are¶ presumed to want to forget. Warnings and horror stories, then, are the¶ liberal reminder that the escape to hedonism and consumption is a vain¶ dodge. The privileged liberal form becomes the stern lecture, the sermon. The appeal to terror —in Helen Caldicott's work, in films like television's¶ "The Day After," and even on bumper stickers and buttons —has¶ been a main staple of antinuclearist politics, a sober, anti-ironic terrorism of images. This is only the most recent, most desperate version of a political¶ stance familiar in this century. Liberals, conservatives, Marxists,¶ Christians —all felt, all along, that they were dealing with the real, with¶ reality. The gravity of that encounter meant that public life would be¶ formed in competitive narrations of sober, somber articulations of the¶ necessary, the universal. As the real becomes less and less compelling a¶ mediator of disputes, the mood turns desperate. If the horror stories fail¶ to hold attention, the logic of the situation dictates a negatively nihilistic¶ diagnosis of "human nature." Citizens who seem oblivious to the strongest¶ warning call must be in the mold of Nero. The requirements imposed¶ by the real —not the deconstruction of those requirements — are the¶ source of nihilism. The postmodern analysis is more compelling. Rather than a nihilistic¶ subject, somehow already burned by the nuke, we have subjects constituted¶ in new ways. Political authority is still explicable, even if shared¶ convictions about reality become untenable. In a monarchy, subjects just¶ knew that the king or queen embodied political authority—power was¶ vested in the monarch. Then, the antiroyalists we now call classical liberals¶ just knew that a scientific analysis of nature would liberate them¶ from those old fashioned monarchists. Then, the radicals who followed¶ Marx just knew that the science of historical materialism represented reality,¶ promising a future revolution that would dissolve political authority. These last two form the base of modernity. These two great opponents —¶ liberals and Marxists—have shared a privileged certainty, which both obtained¶ from a shared, scientific base. The term "postmodern" implies that¶ the era is ending, but it hardly signals the demise of political power. No¶ longer externalized in the body of the king or relations of production, or nature,¶ power becomes internalized. We started to create a new self, a new set¶ of habits and practices that we use to identify ourselves as individuals. We¶ become calculators, seeing problems as opportunities to weigh costs and¶ benefits, knowing very well that any other kind of motivation will be suspect.¶ Still, we continually find ourselves in situations that demand that great¶ decisions be made before we quite know the categories. Calculations require¶ facts, but politics continually presents situations without facts. That should tell us that we are not calculating machines, or at least we aren't very good¶ ones. And such contradictions begin to promise a politics. We could, at least, protest against the kind of selves produced in the¶ modern era. That politics would be cultural, its standards more aesthetic¶ than scientific. It would be an odd politics, because it would not promise¶ answers or any such certainty. Solutions, whether mathematical or chemical,¶ would become less important as political metaphors, and, contrary¶ to the words of deconstruction's many critics, this would not be the end¶ of politics. Examples of a better politics abound, available to anyone who has abandoned the "solution" metaphor. Indeed, there exists an argument¶ that makes it necessary, not optional, to identify "solution" talk as¶ metaphorical, giving the fundamental option of discarding that metaphor¶ to anyone who took all this very seriously. That is to say, identifying "solution"¶ as a metaphor (and identifying other metaphors) was not an evasion¶ of the challenge —what's your solution? —but the main work. That¶ which must be done to understand where we're at. There is an important implication from that decision. The political¶ approach I have in mind would understand that power continues. Any¶ political stance based on rising expectations sometimes exaggerates¶ promises. Revolution, transcendence, liberation —all those are dubious¶ promises, producing a falsely certain future in whose name action is justified. Postmodernism, then, clears ground for political action —not¶ acquiescence —when it demonstrates that power will not somehow be¶ rendered null, but will be the context of ongoing performance, exposure,¶ release, and recapture. The demise of promises of generalized liberation is¶ hardly the end of politics. Nor does that demise even signal that politics¶ has become unappealing, a matter to be avoided. And it certainly doesn't¶ mean that liberation is now located in some other area. There are still¶ struggles to expose oppression and discipline and surveillance. As power¶ is increasingly deployed in ways that do not oppress or dominate, but create¶ us as power's subjects, inscribing its practices into our disciplines and¶ habits, strategies of response will change, not disappear. And the new responses¶ will share an identifiable pattern. Successful critique henceforth¶ will come from those who can make what had seemed real, before they¶ addressed it, now seem thoroughly problematic. We enter the era of the¶ puzzle. Faced with the critique that he had somehow ended politics, Baudrillard¶ responds in terms of his own political life, a life of writing and problematizing.¶ He asks, What organizing principle keeps me at work, if not the driving¶ force of the real? Why write? Isn't writing a cynical exercise if one cannot¶ compel responses? But Baudrillard answers with an exclamation, a performance¶ in the face of shocked surprise that he could stop writing unless the¶ real actually intervened. For me, it's in the realm of the intellectual wager. If there were an¶ absolute term of the nuclear apocalypse in the realm of the real, then at¶ that point I would stop, I wouldn't write anymore! God knows, if the¶ metaphor really collapses into reality, I won't have any more to do. That¶ would not even be a question of resignation —it's no longer possible to¶ think at that point.4 Baudrillard's conclusion is delightful —he will, of course, go about his¶ business, trying to figure out what politics can be and how all of this image-manufacturing works, and never freak out. Saving that for later, he¶ reminds us, as did Artaud, that true "last reactions" will be crazed and¶ deranged (not liberal, calm, and authoritative). "Then at that point I¶ would stop, I wouldn't write anymore!" The wager is an alternative metaphor¶ we can understand. If the apocalypse were ever real, all bets would¶ be off. Our present context is less dramatic than that; the power of the¶ nuke is soft, unfocused. And if it were otherwise, Baudrillard's (and my¶ own) project would abruptly stop. But that is (merely) obvious and trivial, not nihilistic in the sense intended for poststructuralists by their liberal¶ critics. Even if no overall agenda is possible, even if our rhetorical claim that¶ all participants in political movement are brothers and sisters becomes¶ untenable, there are still political programs to articulate. As poststructuralism¶ has begun to emerge from its rather theoretical (or perhaps antitheoretical)¶ phase, such political articulations have started to emerge.¶ And this political speculation has found no end of examples in our culture,¶ even if its examples were not taken seriously before these critics embraced¶ them.When postmodernists write about nukes in terms of 007, Atomic¶ Cafe, and crime movie plots, they undermine their own discourse in a¶ way that still hints at an ironic political possibility, even in the face of¶ sobering paradox. This is a political impulse that has already discarded¶ the general, denying the possibility that whole, positive structures could¶ be legitimated by an intellectual class (a Vanguard, to remember the name¶ of one set of U.S. missiles). My discussion of the freeze, for example, does¶ not imply that freezers "thought this way" in establishing their movement,¶ even though several points of their position are represented in their¶ key word.5 Having long since discarded "program" or political¶ "agenda," but also at a distance from pragmatic opportunism, a postmodern¶ politics might still find ways to oppose domination. Donna Haraway's essay on cyborgs stands as one of our best examples¶ of the attempt to construct such a political stance. The essay ends with a¶ political statement, suggesting the possibility of a socialist feminism that¶ moves beyond Marxist roots by acknowledging the poststructuralist alteration¶ of nature and origin. The central site of work (and the central¶ model of worker) passes from factory to cottage.¶ Work is being defined as both literally female and feminized, whether¶ performed by men or women. To be feminized means to be made¶ extremely vulnerable; able to be disassembled, reassembled, exploited as¶ a reserve labor force.6 Insofar as there are new, important factories, they are staffed in industrializing¶ countries by teenage women who are the main sources of cash for their families. Robotics and automated offices intensify this "feminization¶ of work."7 At the same time, communications technologies undercut¶ public life, creating a "privatization" far more important than anything¶ imagined by neoconservative economists. But Haraway believes a "feminist¶ science/technology politics" could emerge, confronting and rejecting the new¶ forms of technology-enabled power. Even without a "before the fall" mythology¶ to rely on, oppositions can become powerful. And Haraway so enlivens¶ this possibility that her closing line resonates with plausibility, creating¶ the sort of politics poststructuralism requires. "Though both are bound in¶ the spiral dance, I would rather be a cyborg than a goddess."8¶ In Stanley Kubrick's film Dr. Strangelove, the end of the world stands¶ for hope.9 The seemingly inappropriate version of "We'll Meet Again"¶ that accompanies the mushroom cloud conclusion sends news of a break¶ with the past, as does the subtitle, How I Learned to Stop Worrying and¶ Love the Bomb. It will be quite a different posture we will have to invent¶ to engage the technology of our times in a politicizing mode. I am arguing¶ that the liberal, humanistic discourse actually resolves questions, allowing¶ us to reify our value choices and avoid politics. In the apocalyptic climax¶ of Dr. Strangelove, the computerized plans of all sides are overcome.¶ We have little trouble imagining that, at the end, some of us would not¶ find insight into humanity, but would reenact subservient disciplines,¶ even defending the coins in a soda machine. The heroism of other characters¶ in that film repeatedly works against the human prospect. With a¶ bit of human irrationality, a quandary of strategic moves gone awry, and¶ the pragmatic, typically American, last-minute fix by the archetypal¶ American bomber pilot (portrayed by Slim Pickens), humanity manages¶ to destroy itself. So much for our calm, deliberate attempts to manage¶ technology. Displacing those noble impulses is the ad hoc, impassioned¶ fix by Pickens, who takes the bomb as his body, riding it down with the¶ exuberance of a bronco rider. This works. When that happens, the questions of whether modern technology is¶ "good" or "bad" are left far behind. Those questions and the deliberate,¶ cautious choice associated with them neither destroy the world nor prevent¶ its destruction. The real engagement of actual persons is, finally, the¶ crux of the matter, even if it is revealed too late, as Pickens exuberantly¶ rides the bomb out of the chute, ending our prospects altogether.¶ Such an approach is available to us, one hopes to a better end. Once¶ one is engaged with robots, computers, and even the bomb, a conversation¶ is begun with what is best understood as a new agent in the world.¶ We can begin to ask what has been produced in us, how that production¶ has been accomplished, and how the production could be exposed. Activists¶ could begin by understanding how some of our fables have posed a¶ very strange plot. Citizens of the nuclear age are supposed to have been reassured and secured by (were even told to "sleep more soundly"¶ amidst) hugely discomforting technologies that tend to hide or, even,¶ walk autonomously away. The discourse that would raise those discomforts in a critical manner¶ has hardly begun to be identified, but hints of it emerge from the art¶ world, even from the most popular of art forms. Numerous strategies¶ have been formulated. We could cancel alienation with expressive inarticulateness,¶ or we could array the styles, images, and tropes of the culture¶ against each other, reenacting implosion. To cite just one example¶ from a recently popular rock song, R.E.M.'s apocalyptic ditty rings out¶ with incongruous joyousness, even glee: "It's the end of the world as we¶ know it (and I feel fine)."10 These are endless endings, last words that could never be heard, a fall¶ followed by a winter beyond all experience, "an original end of sorts, the¶ final fall of the fall, the spectacular fallout."11 In the face of such an ending,¶ the nuclear critic can still assemble a package of interventions, rehearsing¶ arguments that will be useful in universities, laboratories, and¶ institutes. It has always been the task of radical political analysis to¶ announce —often joyously —that the "world as we know it" has ended.¶ But this time the task is trickier. Not only the world, but also the most¶ fundamental ways "we know it" —language and discourse—have been¶ undermined.

#### **The affirmative strategy creates the US as a scapegoat—whitewashing the actions of the Pakistani and Yemeni governments**

Ahmed 2013 (Dawood I. [lawyer and doctoral candidate in international and comparative law @ U of Chicago]; Rethinking Anti-Drone Legal Strategies: Questioning Pakistani and Yemeni “Consent”; Yale Journal; summer; kdf)

Abstract—The United States has been carrying out drone¶ strikes within Yemen and Pakistan since 2002 and 2004¶ respectively. Opponents have attempted to halt the use of¶ drones by invoking legal arguments against the United States¶ government. In doing so, they have overlooked the possibility¶ that it may have taken ‘two to drone.’ In light of claims that the¶ Pakistani and Yemeni governments have consented to drone¶ strikes, the article queries why anti-drone lawyers have not yet¶ employed similar legal arguments to determine whether and on¶ what terms these governments have consented or acquiesced¶ to drone strikes, even if such consent was forced. It also argues¶ that a narrow strategy of constraining only the United States¶ government while not engaging in parallel lawsuits that will¶ shed light on the alleged involvement of these governments¶ not only reduces the effectiveness of anti-drone advocacy but¶ may also allow the Pakistani and Yemeni governments to dodge¶ domestic accountability for harms caused by drone strikes.

#### Ending the use of drones kills thousands of people in Pakistan

Foust, 2012 (Joshua; Why the US Still Needs to Use Drone in Pakistan; Oct 9; www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/10/why-the-us-still-needs-to-use-drones-in-pakistan/263306/; kdf)

Ending the drone strikes is not as simple as halting operations. One way or another, both Washington and Islamabad want to neutralize the militants that threaten their citizens (both countries often disagree over which militants to target, which prompts most of the outcry by Pakistani officials). When Pakistan doesn't use drones to target militants, they kill thousands of civilians and displace hundreds of thousands of people; besides sending hundreds of thousands of troops to forcibly secure the area, the United States just doesn't have any other options for striking at militants.¶ Pakistani politicians, rather than grappling with this complicated challenge, have chosen instead to demagogue the issue. The sophisticated media wing of the ISI constantly redirects any ire for its own support of Islamist militancy into anti-American drone outrage. Imran Khan, the popular cricket player-turned politician, has been particularly brazen in this regard, going so far as to hold an " anti-drone rally" in South Waziristan this Sunday. This rally does nothing to address the horrors of militancy in the FATA, and it redirects blame for the shattered communities of the region from Islamabad to Washington. It makes sense, then, that the Taliban have endorsed his rally and promised his followers safe passage.¶ Militancy in the FATA can only be marginalized through the building of normal politics and the rule of law: abolishing the FCR, building a normal police force and legal system, and de-militarizing Islamabad's engagement with the local population. This doesn't have a terribly strong chance of success in the short term. There is no real appetite in the rest of Pakistan to support the full normalization of politics in the FATA, and the military establishment actively supports politicians that choose to condemn the drone strikes rather than focus on the political issues underlying the government's long relationship with militancy.¶ Ultimately, it was the decision of the military and the ISI to support terrorist movements that has turned the FATA into the haven for militancy it is today. It must be those same institutions that need to come to grips with their own history of supporting these groups if there's to be any hope for change.¶ Pakistani politics are not currently oriented around this painful discussion, and so long as demagogues like Imran Khan play the issue for cheap anti-Americanism, that painful discussion is unlikely to happen.¶ In the meantime, that leaves drones as the only anti-militancy option Islamabad and Washington can agree on. Without Pakistan choosing to reform itself and tackle its decades of support for Islamist militancy seriously, there will simply be no other feasible way to fight terror cells ensconced in the country.

#### **Their imagery of terrorism creates a victimized image of the occident due to the actions of “Islam”—this ramps up to global “wars on terror” to spread democratic ideals and American propaganda**

Badiou 2006 (Alain, Polemics, Verso, p. 15-17, kdf)

**The destruction of New York's Twin Towers** by planes whose passengers and neo-pilots – **those assassinating impostors -- were transformed into incendiary projectiles brought about every­where a particular affect.** Even for those who more or less secretly celebrated – an extremely numerous crowd, some hundreds of millions of enemies of the lugubrious and solitary American superpower -- **it nonetheless amounted to an unbe­lievable mass crime.** 'Attack' is an inappropriate word; it evokes the nihilist bombings of the Tsar's coaches, or the attack of Sarajevo. It has *a fin de siede* ring to it, but is of another century. ,At the beginning of this millennium, **the self-evidence of that affect registers the extraordinary combination of violence, calm, quiet relentlessness, organization, indifference to destruction, agony, and fire that is required in today's technologically sophisticated conditions to bring about the death of many thousands of everyday people** and workers deep in the heart of a great metropolis. **It was an enormous murder, lengthily premeditated, and yet silent. No one claimed responsibility for it. For these reasons**, we can say that formally speaking this mass crime, which aimed indiscriminately, and with the most perfect cruelty, **to destabilize blindly a 'normal' situation, conjures up the fascist concept of action.** Consequently, **throughout the world, and regardless of the immediate condition - devastated or complicit - of one's soul, there was a numbing stupefaction, a kind of paroxysmally denied disbelief: the affect signalling a disaste**r. **Philosophy must certainly register this prime evidence of affect.** Yet it has a duty never to be, with it. Religion might proclaim to have faith in the self-evidences of the heart, while art, as Gilles Deleuze says, gives form to percepts and affects. Philo­sophy, **for its part, must -- this is its arid objective -- come to the concept, no matter how traumatic the affect being opened up to investigation or placed under construction might be.** So, suggesting itself to philosophical labour is a second kind of self-evidence, not that pertaining to the affect, **but that pertaining to a name: 'terrorism'. This nominal self'-evidence** (that the mass crime of New York, signalled by the affect of the disaster, is a terrorist action**) has played a decisive role. In fixing the designated enemy, it has cemented a world coalition, authorized the UN to declare that the US is in a state of 'self-defence', and enabled the programming of the targets of vengeance. More significantly, the word `terrorism' here has had a threefold function: First, it has determined a subject; that is, the one targeted by the terrorist act, the one who has been struck, is full of bereavement, and must lead a vengeful riposte. This subject has been referred to, depending upon the preference, as 'our societies', 'the West', 'the democracies', or even as 'America'** - but the last only at the price, paid for quickly by the editorialists, that 'we' are 'all American'. 2**Second, it supports predicates. On this occasion, the terrorism will be 'Islamic'. And third it has determined the sequence under way in its entirety, henceforth called that of the 'war against terrorism**'. We've been informed that it will be a long war. An Here, once again, philosophy, when it registers as important a symptom as the widespread self-evidence of the word 'terrorism', has the duty to examine its origin and its impact. Simply, there are two rules to the method. First, philosophy must not be transitive to affect, no matter how widely accepted it might be. **A crime is a crime, agreed. But the consequences of a crime, even one that is formally fascistic, should not mechani­cally lead to other crimes. And this designation (`crime') should equally be applied to state crimes, including those -- innumerable – committed by 'democratic' states.** For, ever since Aeschylus' *Oresteia,* so for a long time, we've known that the question is to know how to replace violence with justice. Second, **philosophy does not accept dominant names without critical examination, irrespective of how commonly held they are. We know that these designations are under the control of the established powers and their propaganda.** Hence **we shall undertake a meticulous examination of labels. Our point of departure is the central label, 'terrorism'. Then, on the basis of this, we willengage in a critique of the triplet of the predicate (`Islamic'), the subject (`the West') and the sequence (`the war against terrorism').**

## Solvency

#### The aff doesn’t do anything. Strict scrutiny will allow failure.

#### Status Quo Solves- Drones will be grounded through bureaucracy

Wolfgang, July 28 (Ben; Funding Schemes in Congress could ground drones; FAA pressured over privacy; www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/jul/28/funding-schemes-in-congress-could-ground-drones/?utm\_source=RSS\_Feed&utm\_medium=RSS; kdf)

A funding bill now before the Senate essentially would stop the process in its tracks by prohibiting the Federal Aviation Administration from moving forward until it completes a detailed report on drones’ potential privacy impact.¶ The report, called for in the Senate’s fiscal 2014 transportation appropriations measure, would be yet another hurdle in the FAA’s already complex, time-consuming drone integration initiative.¶ The agency has been charged by Congress to write rules and regulations allowing drones — now used primarily by the military, law enforcement and researchers — to operate commercially in U.S. skies by September 2015, but the industry fears that deadline is likely to be missed.¶ Requiring the FAA, which traditionally deals only with airspace safety and has little experience in writing Fourth Amendment protections, to craft a comprehensive privacy report would all but guarantee the date will be pushed back.¶ Leaders in the unmanned aerial systems sector warn that such setbacks will hamper American technological innovation and carry economic consequences.¶ “Privacy is an important issue, and one that deserves to be considered carefully. But further restrictions on FAA integration will only set back important progress,” said Ben Gielow, government relations manager with the Association for Unmanned Vehicle Systems International (AUVSI), the drone sector’s leading trade group.¶ “If we are not able to keep the integration on track, the U.S. could lose out on creating tens of thousands of jobs and undermine the growth of a new industry at a time when we need it most,” he said.¶ The Senate bill doesn’t explicitly call for the FAA to stop drone integration efforts, but it would establish a de facto moratorium by cutting off funding for the process.

#### federal judges inevitably with drones

Katyal 2013 (Neal K. [former acting solicitor general, prof of national security law @ Georgetown; Feb 21; www.nytimes.com/2013/02/21/opinion/an-executive-branch-drone-court.html; kdf)

There are many reasons a drone court composed of generalist federal judges will not work. They lack national security expertise, they are not accustomed to ruling on lightning-fast timetables, they are used to being in absolute control, their primary work is on domestic matters and they usually rule on matters after the fact, not beforehand.¶ Even the questions placed before the FISA Court aren’t comparable to what a drone court would face; they involve more traditional constitutional issues — not rapidly developing questions about whether to target an individual for assassination by a drone strike.