### 2AC PTX

#### 1. Immigration reform doesn’t solve food – shrinking labor pool

Plumer 13 [Brad, reporter specializing in domestic policy, particularly energy and environmental issues, Washington Post; “We’re running out of farm workers. Immigration reform won’t help.” Washington Post; January 29, 2013; http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/01/29/the-u-s-is-running-out-of-farm-workers-immigration-reform-may-not-help/]

For years, one of the groups pushing hardest for immigration reform has been the U.S. food industry. Farmers have long grumbled about a shortage of labor, and they’ve asked for policies that make it easier to hire foreign workers from places like Mexico. Getting harder and harder to find. (John Moore – Getty Images) But looser immigration laws may not be able to keep our food cheap forever. A recent study suggests that U.S. farms could well face a shortage of low-cost labor in the years ahead **no matter what Congress does on immigration.** That’s because Mexico is getting richer and can no longer supply as many rural farm workers to the United States. And it won’t be nearly as easy to import low-wage agricultural workers from elsewhere. For decades, farms in the United States have relied heavily on low-wage foreign workers — mainly from Mexico — to work their fields. In 2006, 77 percent of all agricultural workers in the United States were foreign-born. (And half of those foreign workers were undocumented immigrants.) All that cheap labor has helped keep down U.S. food prices, particularly for labor-intensive fruits and vegetables. But that labor pool is now drying up. In recent years, we’ve seen a spate of headlines like this from CNBC: “California Farm Labor Shortage ‘Worst It’s Been, Ever’.” Typically, these stories blame drug-related violence on the Mexican border or tougher border enforcement for the decline. Hence the call for new guest-worker programs. But a new paper from U.C. Davis offers up a simpler explanation for the labor shortage. Mexico is getting richer. And, when a country gets richer, its pool of rural agricultural labor shrinks. Not only are Mexican workers shifting into other sectors like construction, but Mexico’s own farms are increasing wages. That means U.S. farms will have to pay higher and higher wages to attract a dwindling pool of available Mexican farm workers. “It’s a simple story,” says Edward Taylor, an agricultural economist at U.C. Davis and one of the study’s authors. ”By the mid-twentieth century, Americans stopped doing farm work. And we were only able to avoid a farm-labor crisis by bringing in workers from a nearby country that was at an earlier stage of development. Now that era is coming to an end.” Taylor and his co-authors argue that the United States could face a sharp adjustment period as a result. Americans appear unwilling to do the sort of low-wage farm work that we have long relied on immigrants to do. And, the paper notes, it may be difficult to find an abundance of cheap farm labor anywhere else — potential targets such as Guatemala and El Salvador are either too small or are urbanizing too rapidly. So the labor shortages will keep getting worse. And that leaves several choices. American farmers could simply stop growing crops that need a lot of workers to harvest, such as fruits and vegetables. Given the demand for fresh produce, that seems unlikely. Alternatively, U.S. farms could continue to invest in new labor-saving technologies, such as “shake-and-catch” machines to harvest fruits and nuts. “Under this option,” the authors write, “capital improvements in farm production would increase the marginal product of farm labor; U.S. farms would hire fewer workers and pay higher wages.” That could be a boon to domestic workers — studies have found that 23 percent of U.S. farm worker families are below the poverty line. In the meantime, however, farm groups are hoping they can fend off that day of reckoning by revamping the nation’s immigration laws. The bipartisan immigration-reform proposal unveiled in the Senate on Monday contained several provisions aimed at boosting the supply of farm workers, including the promise of an easier path to citizenship. Taylor, however, is not convinced that this is a viable long-term strategy. “The idea that you can design a guest-worker program or any other immigration policy to solve this farm labor problem isn’t realistic,” he says. “It assumes that there’s a willingness to keep doing farm work on the other side of the border. And that’s already dropping off.”

#### 2. Healthcare thumps

Sargent 10/31 [Greg, Washington Post, The Morning Plum: The deficit is falling. In Washington, that doesn’t matter]

But on their side, Democrats have the falling deficit. What’s more, though Washington is consumed with how badly the Obamacare rollout is going for Democrats, the truth is that more Americans agree with Dems when it comes to getting the priorities and balance right on taxes and spending. In these talks, Dems should remember that the public – and the falling deficit — are largely on their side. \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* \* HOUSE GOP PIVOTS FROM OBAMACARE TO OBAMACARE: David Drucker reports on the coming game plan for House Republicans: Still smarting from a politically damaging government shutdown that hogged the spotlight and obscured problems with the Affordable Care Act, House Republicans have deliberately shifted strategies. Rather than instigate high-stakes, politically risky confrontations with President Obama, they have embraced a more traditional, low-key approach that focuses on achieving incremental conservative reforms. This legislative strategy has a second, equally important purpose: It’s unlikely to distract from the GOP’s aggressive investigation into Obamacare’s error-plagued implementation. “People are focused on how bad Obamacare is. There’s no sense in putting up hyperpartisan bills that take attention away from that,” a senior Republican House aide told the Washington Examiner. Okay, so the GOP will pivot from a stupid “hyper-partisan” strategy to undermine Obamacare to a smarter hyper-partisan strategy to undermine Obamacare. Look, there’s no excusing the rollout problem, which are awful. Accountability is required, and real Congressional oversight would absolutely be welcome here. But there’s no reason to believe Republicans are capable of supplying it.

#### 3. No link uniqueness – military restriction squabbles now

Politico 10/30 [Air Force lawyers draw fire over sexual assault policy By DARREN SAMUELSOHN | 10/30/13 11:58 AM EDT Updated: 10/30/13 4:47 PM EDT]

A letter obtained by POLITICO shows Lt. Gen. Richard Harding, the Air Force judge advocate general, and Col. Jeffrey Rockwell, urging their fellow military lawyers to take sides against a Senate amendment expected to come up for a floor vote before Thanksgiving that **removes the command chain from major criminal prosecutions.** “Please read, absorb and share with your commanders and media types wherever you are located. This will truly make a difference,” Harding wrote earlier this month to the Air Force JAG Corps before introducing Rockwell’s arguments against the proposal being offered by Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand (D-N.Y.).

#### 4. Immigration is dead

Chotiner 10/25 [Isaac, New Republic, Immigration Reform is Doomed. At Least For Now. http://www.newrepublic.com/article/115348/immigration-reform-cannot-pass-midterm-elections]

The New Republic's Alec MacGillis offers up various reasons why immigration reform has a better chance of passing in the next year than conventional wisdom currently holds. I appreciate his optimism, but immigration is doomed—at least until after the midterm elections. Alec is probably right that a few things have improved the prospects for a bill. House Speaker John Boehner, who clearly wants one, is in a stronger position with his caucus than he was even several months ago. Immigration reform has several rich backers. President Obama is desperate for a bill. And Congress, after the shutdown debacle, may feel the need to make it appear as if something, anything can come out of Washington. Unfortunately, all of these things pale in comparison to the larger question of whether the bill is in the interest of House Republicans, and the party more generally. Here is Alec's take: It’s in the Republicans’ interest. Why would the cautious, conflict-averse Boehner want to put himself through the hassle, even if he does have a path forward? Because, of course, he and so many other leaders of his party and the conservative movement—Paul Ryan, Karl Rove, Grover Norquist—grasp that the party cannot continue be seen as obstructing immigration reform by the country’s growing legions of Hispanic and Asian-American voters. Yes, many of the same leaders were warning the hard-liners in the House and Senate off of the defund-Obamacare government-shutdown path to no avail, but those warnings were highly ambivalent, a matter of tactical disagreement after years in which the leaders had been banging the same anti-Obamacare drum. Whereas in this case the leaders are truly in favor of immigration reform, even if just for reasons of self-preservation. This may be true, but it suggests—in the best case scenario—that Congress passes a bill after the midterms, rather than before them. Pretend you are a House Republican, and thus in almost all cases are from a very conservative district. What is your incentive to pass an immigration bill before November 2014? Not only would it make you vulnerable to a primary challenge, but it isn't even obvious that it would strengthen your position in the general election, especially considering the way House districts are drawn, and that non-presidential election years tend to have older and whiter electorates. Alec is right that eventually Republicans need to stop bleeding minority votes. But that is part of a long, long, long-term project. Politics is a zero-sum game, and if Obama signs an immigration bill, the Democrats are going to get most of the credit. Ideally, then, Republicans could win the 2016 election without supporting immigration reform and have a Republican president sign the bill. (They blew their chance in 2007.) But it may be hard to win the next election without doing so. Still, even in 2016, with a bigger electorate, it still isn't necessarily in the interests of Republican congressmen to support a bill. Immigration reform is going to be, at best, a tough sell in 2015. Before the next congressional election, it's a nearly impossible dream.

#### 5. Obama supports women in combat – won’t circumvent

AP 13 (Associated Press, Feb 04, 2013, “Obama Says He Won't Hesitate on Women in Combat,” http://www.military.com/daily-news/2013/02/04/obama-says-he-wont-hesitate-on-women-in-combat.html //nimo)

WASHINGTON -- President Barack Obama says he would have no hesitation ordering women into combat and explained that, as a practical matter, they're already serving that role.¶ Obama, who spoke with CBS television shortly before Sunday's Super Bowl game, was asked about the recent order ending the Pentagon's ban on women serving in combat.¶ Obama said female troops are already vulnerable to attack and they've been wounded and killed carrying out their jobs. He said they are taking great risks and should not be prevented from advancing in their careers.

#### 6. Not mutually exclusive – policy maker can do both

#### 7. Food shocks inevitable – too many alt causes.

Tipson 12 [Frederick, special advisor to the Center for Science,Technology and Peacebuilding at the U.S. Institute of Peace, where hewas a 2011-12 Jennings Randolph Senior Fellow. He worked previously for the UN Development Programme, Microsoft, the MarkleFoundation, the Council on Foreign Relations, Hongkong Telecom,AT&T, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the University ofVirginia School of Law. Global Food Insecurity and "Political Malnutrition," June 2012, Number 7, German Marshall Fund Connections, http://www.gmfus.org/wp-content/blogs.dir/1/files\_mf/1339595984Tipson\_GlobalFoodInsecurity\_Jun12.pdf]

Meanwhile, the political dimensions of “food insecurity” go well beyond our compassion for people in the poorest countries who are most vulnerable to famine and malnutrition. Even during the remainder of this decade, we face a transition from localized food shortages and insecurities toward a more pervasive environment of global “food shocks” that have serious political consequences even for the richer world. 3 The combined effects of population trends, climate changes, water shortages, soil erosion or contamination, increased meat consumption, fisheries depletion, major livestock epidemics, or serious crop failures in overlapping and cascading ripple effects will strain already-vulnerable economies and political systems. Sudden price increases or shortages could prompt volatile popular reactions, especially if citizens even in “well-fed” locations lose trust in markets and governments to assure their access to adequate food supplies.

#### 8. Political capital is irrelevant

Dickinson, ’09,– professor of political science at Middlebury College and taught previously at Harvard University where he worked under the supervision of presidential scholar Richard Neustadt (5/26/09, Matthew, Presidential Power: A NonPartisan Analysis of Presidential Politics, “Sotomayor, Obama and Presidential Power,” <http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/>)

As for Sotomayor, from here the path toward almost certain confirmation goes as follows: the Senate Judiciary Committee is slated to hold hearings sometime this summer (this involves both written depositions and of course open hearings), which should lead to formal Senate approval before Congress adjourns for its summer recess in early August. So Sotomayor will likely take her seat in time for the start of the new Court session on October 5. (I talk briefly about the likely politics of the nomination process below). What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power. Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress. That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences? How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes? These measures, however, are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power. This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is rarely influenced by anything a president does. Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence. Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants. (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying. But this is not to say that presidents lack influence. Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose. That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting. And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination. Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox. That is, how senators decide to vote on Sotomayor will have almost nothing to do with Obama’s lobbying from here on in (or lack thereof). His real influence has already occurred, in the decision to present Sotomayor as his nominee. If we want to measure Obama’s “power”, then, we need to know what his real preference was and why he chose Sotomayor. My guess – and it is only a guess – is that after conferring with leading Democrats and Republicans, he recognized the overriding practical political advantages accruing from choosing an Hispanic woman, with left-leaning credentials. We cannot know if this would have been his ideal choice based on judicial philosophy alone, but presidents are never free to act on their ideal preferences. Politics is the art of the possible. Whether Sotomayer is his first choice or not, however, her nomination is a reminder that the power of the presidency often resides in the president’s ability to dictate the alternatives from which Congress (or in this case the Senate) must choose. Although Republicans will undoubtedly attack Sotomayor for her judicial “activism” (citing in particular her decisions regarding promotion and affirmative action), her comments regarding the importance of gender and ethnicity in influencing her decisions, and her views regarding whether appellate courts “make” policy, they run the risk of alienating Hispanic voters – an increasingly influential voting bloc (to the extent that one can view Hispanics as a voting bloc!) I find it very hard to believe she will not be easily confirmed. In structuring the alternative before the Senate in this manner, then, Obama reveals an important aspect of presidential power that cannot be measured through legislative boxscores.

#### 10. **Rhetoric of resource conflict is patriarchal and makes their impact inevitable**

Glazebrook, Professor of Philosophy and Religion Studies at the University of North Texas 02 (Trish, “Karen Warren's Ecofeminism”, Ethics and the Environment 7:2, Autumn 2002, JSTOR)

Ecofeminism has conceptual beginnings in the French tradition of femi- nist theory. In 1952, Simone de Beauvoir pointed out that in the logic of patriarchy, both women and nature appear as other (de Beauvoir 1952, 114). In 1974, Luce Irigaray diagnosed philosophically a phallic logic of the Same that precludes representation of woman's alterity, so that it subjects women to man's domination (Irigaray 1974). In the same year, Fran^oised'Eaubonne coined the term, "l'eco-feminisme," to point to the necessity for women to bring about ecological revolution, and used the slogan, "Feminism or death [Le feminismeou la mort]" (d'Eaubonne 1974, 221), to argue that the phallic order is the source of a double threat to human being: overpopulation, and the depletion of resources. Exploita- tion of female reproductive power has caused an excess of births, and hence overpopulation; while an excess of production has exploited natural resources to the point of their destruction. Though "feminism or death" was a battle cry, it was also a warning that human being cannot survive patriarchy's ecological consequences. In North America, the alliance between feminism and ecology like- wise began in 1974, when Sandra Marburg and Lisa Watson hosted a conference at Berkeley entitled "Women and the Environment." The fol- lowing year, Rosemary Radford Ruether pointed out that "Women must see that there can be no liberation for them and no solution to ecologi- cal crisis within a society whose fundamental model of relationships con- tinues to be one of domination" (Ruether 1975, 204). She called for a unification of feminist and ecological interests in the vision of a society transformed from values of possession, conquest, and accumulation to reci- procity, harmony, and mutual interdependence. In 1991, Karen Warren edited an issue of Hypatia devoted entirely to ecofeminism, which was later expanded and republished under the title Ecological Feminist Phi- losophies. This anthology was ground-breaking, because in it Warren con- solidated a collection of diverse voices, not into an ecofeminist platform as such, but into a vision of the lay of the land, as it were, with respect to ecofeminism. Although Warren has been writing as an ecofeminist since 1987, it was not until 2000 that she published a sustained treatment in her own voice: Ecofeminist Philosophy: A Western Perspective on What It Is and Why It Matters. This book is the culmination of her thinking for over a decade. Her perspective, very much in the spirit of d' Eaubonne and Ruethei; is as political, social, and practical as it is philosophical, and constitutes a research program that extends beyond the walls of the Academy in its challenge to the social order. The book can be used to answer some of the criticisms that ecofeminism has received. I will use Warren's work to ad- dress in particular the validity of the foundational ecofeminist assumption that environmental issues are feminist issues; the charge against feminism in general that it reflects only the needs of white, middle-class, Western women; the claim, especially in reference to spirituality, that ecofeminism reinscribes gender essentialism; and the challenge ecofeminism offers to traditional philosophy, including how such an inclusivist movement can respond to the history of philosophy without simply reproducing its exclu- sionary politics.

#### 11. Immigration won’t pass, and push comes after fiscal issues.

Nowicki 10/20 [Dan Nowicki, The Arizona Republic, U.S. HOPES DIM FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM http://www.codewit.com/north-america/13241-u-s-hopes-dim-for-immigration-reform]

PHOENIX -- Immigration reform, the centerpiece of President Barack Obama's second-term domestic agenda, lost momentum amid the partisan brinkmanship that led to the government shutdown. Some reform opponents believe the profound lack of trust between House Republicans and the White House all but ensures the issue won't proceed this year. Obama, however, last week signaled that he is not surrendering on one of the issues he ran on when he was first elected president in 2008. In an interview with Univision's Los Angeles affiliate, Obama indicated he will press forward on immigration reform immediately **after the dust settles from the fiscal fight** and demand that House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, and other Republican leaders allow a vote on a Senate-passed comprehensive bill.

#### 12. Your impact evidence doesn’t assume watered down bill.

Kohn 13 [Sally, Salon, THURSDAY, APR 18, 2013 11:12 AM EDT Immigration: The latest watered-down compromise GOP hates anyway New proposal will do little to fix our broken system, and passing it will cost Obama real capital. Sound familiar? BY SALLY KOHN http://www.salon.com/2013/04/18/will\_immigration\_bill\_be\_a\_replay\_of\_guns/]

In their desire to find a compromise acceptable to the chronically short-sighted and self-destructive Republican Party, Democrats have crafted an immigration bill that is for the most part as unobjectionable as it is uninspired. The bill cobbles together a series of pragmatic concessions that, while perhaps sufficient to overcome conservative objections, will likely prove wholly insufficient at actually addressing the problem it was designed to solve — that is, fixing our broken immigration system. The tangle of hurdles and exclusions, loopholes for businesses and pitfalls for immigrants, is precisely the mess we should be cleaning up, not making worse.

### 2AC K

#### 1. The aff should get to weigh our impact against the impacts of the kritik – other framework moots the 1AC and destroys topic specific education debate becomes centered on abstract theories rather than policy action

#### Women in combat solves – Tickner agrees with the aff

Ann **Tickner**- 19**92**- Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security

When we think about the provision of national security we enter into what has been, and continues to be, an almost exclusively male domain. While most women support what they take to be legitimate calls for state action in the interests of international security, the task of defining, defending, and advancing the security interests of the state is a man's affair, a task that, through its association with war, has been especially valorized and rewarded in many cultures throughout history. As Simone de Beauvoir's explanation for male superiority suggests, giving one's life for one's country has been considered the highest form of patriotism, but it is an act from which women have been virtually excluded. While men have been associated with defending the state and advancing its international interests as soldiers and diplomats, women have typically been engaged in the "ordering" and "comforting" roles both in the domestic sphere, as mothers and basic needs providers, and in the caring professions, as teachers, nurses, and social workers. [2](http://www.ciaonet.org/book/tickner/tickner13.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22note2) The role of women with respect to national security has been ambiguous: defined as those whom the state and its men are protecting, women have had little control over the conditions of their protection.

#### The military is too great a social force to leave to the realm of masculinity – their Enloe ev agrees with the aff

Enloe 13 Cynthia, Research Professor at Clark University; “Combat: The Zone of Women’s Liberation?” *The Progressive*; January 24, 2013; http://www.progressive.org/combat-the-zone-of-women-and-liberation

In a country whose popular culture is as profoundly militarized as ours (think Junior ROTC in high schools, think B-22 fly-overs at the opening of the NFL season), it is all too easy to militarize even women’s liberation.¶ Militarization happens any time that the protection of women’s rights is either justified by appealing to military necessity or measured in terms of women’s participation in war-waging.¶ Neither those women nor those men deployed in wartime combat should be imagined by the rest of us as “the real heroes” or the “real patriots.” Infantry bunkers and fighter plane cockpits should not be where genuine “first class citizens” are cultivated.¶ This feminist caveat, though, does not mean that lifting the Pentagon’s artificial ban is insignificant. The military remains one of the most powerful political and cultural institutions in contemporary America. Its influence can be seen in our lopsided federal budget, in our entertainment and sports industries, in our science and technology, in our schools and in our Congress.¶ An institution this powerful cannot be permitted to sustain its entrenched masculinized culture. This, after all, is the same institutional culture that has rewarded mid-level and senior officers for ignoring American male soldiers’ sexual assaults on their female comrades (as documented in the Oscar-nominated film “The Invisible War,” ).

Perm do the aff and overcome shallow male-constructed visions of IR requires ontological revisionism

#### **3. Gender integration in the military OPPOSES militarism – support for one does not indicate a support for the other**

Herbert 94 (Melissa S. Herbert, Assistant Professor of Sociology at Hamline University, “Feminism, Militarism, and Attitudes Toward the Role of Women in the Military,” Feminist Issues/Fall 1994 //nimo)

Simply put, the clear findings are that those with a feminist ideology are likely ¶ to support the right of women to equal participation in the military. In contrast, militarism indicates a slight likelihood of lack of support. The critical point is that ¶ while these relationships are both correlated in the expected direction, support for ¶ feminist goals is the much larger force shaping our attitudes toward the role of women ¶ in the military. That is, people's views on women's rights are much more important ¶ than are their views on national defense. Oender integration as an issue of public ¶ policy rests far more in the domain of women's equality than it does in the national ¶ defense. My f'mdings are similar to those presented by Clyde Wilcox (1992) in his ¶ recently published work examining support for women in the military. He believes ¶ that "the data suggest that the public sees this issue more as one of gender equality ¶ than of military policy" (1992, 319). In sum, while the relationship between femi- ¶ nism and militarism is inverse, and the relationship between militarism and support ¶ for gender integration inverse as well, support for the goals of feminism is clearly ¶ the driving force behind what one perceives as the rights of equal access for women ¶ to the military.

#### **4. Perm do the aff and non-mutually exclusive parts of the alt**

#### **5. The plan is not an embrace of status quo American militarism – we can criticize military policy without endorsing militarism AND the military can be good for peace and genocide prevention – it’s a question of how we engage**

DeCew, 95 (Judith Wagner DeCew is Professor of Philosophy and Department Chair at Clark University, where she is also former Associate Dean of the College. The Combat Exclusion and the Role of Women in the Military. Special Issue: Feminist Ethics and Social Policy, Part 1 Volume 10, Issue 1, pages 56–73, February 1995)

Feminists may believe that a right to serve in combat in the military exists but that it should take low priority for feminist thinkers, given the many rights denied women around the world. Or, more strongly, they may reject any female participation in U.S. interventionist and military endeavors, particularly under male orders. They may believe an equal right to carry out U.S. military orders, which they find both morally outrageous and internationally illegal, is a right they would prefer not to have. By arguing against the combat exclusion, however, I am not thereby endorsing current military activities. I believe we can and must discuss the egalitarian concerns raised by the exclusion independently of assessments of general military policies, procedures, and objectives. There are, furthermore, two considerations that make the inequality of the combat exclusion relevant for a wide range of feminists. First, we can idealize the military in such a way that we see it as the kind of institution that will be needed even in a largely peaceful and demilitarized world, to deal with the kinds of peacekeeping efforts that will continue to be necessary in a world without the military institutions and activities with which we are currently familiar. Second, we must realize how nonideal this world is and can be expected to remain. It is arguable that military establishments and military efforts are necessary and even justifiable, when, for example, they are used to prevent atrocities and violations of human rights such as those we have seen in such places as Bosnia and to provide aid in crises like that in Rwanda.5 If this is correct, there is good reason for feminists to be concerned about the combat exclusion, the importance of women gaining equal treatment in the military, and their ability to be promoted to positions where they can transform military practices. Although my argument provides just one liberal feminist approach, it is, I believe, a compelling one.

#### 6. Aff resolves bad parts of militarism by examining the effects of militaristic society on individuals – that’s Cuomo

#### 7. Patriarchy is the root cause of militarism

Nhanenge 7 [Jytte Masters @ U South Africa, paper submitted in part fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of master of arts in the subject Development Studies, “ECOFEMINSM: TOWARDS INTEGRATING THE CONCERNS OF WOMEN, POOR PEOPLE AND NATURE INTO DEVELOPMENT”]

The androcentric premises also have political consequences. They protect the ideological basis of exploitative relationships. Militarism, colonialism, racism, sexism, capitalism and other pathological 'isms' of modernity get legitimacy from the assumption that power relations and hierarchy are inevitably a part of human society, due to man's inherent nature. Because when mankind by nature is autonomous, competitive and violent (i.e. masculine) then coercion and hierarchical structures are necessary to manage conflicts and maintain social order. In this way, the cooperative relationships such as those found among some women and tribal cultures, are by a dualised definition unrealistic and utopian. (Birkeland 1995: 59). This means that power relations are generated by universal scientific truths about human nature, rather than by political and social debate. The consequence is that people cannot challenge the basis of the power structure because they believe it is the scientific truth, so it cannot be otherwise. In this way, militarism is justified as being unavoidable, regardless of its patent irrationality. Likewise, if the scientific "truth" were that humans would always compete for a greater share of resources, then the rational response to the environmental crisis would seem to be "dog-eat-dog" survivalism. This creates a self-fulfilling prophecy in which nature and community simply cannot survive. (Birkeland 1995: 59). This type of social and political power structure is kept in place by social policies. It is based on the assumption that if the scientific method is applied to public policy then social planning can be done free from normative values. However, according to Habermas (Reitzes 1993: 40) the scientific method only conceal pre-existing, unreflected social interests and pre-scientific decisions. Consequently, also social scientists apply the scientific characteristics of objectivity, value-freedom, rationality and quantifiability to social life. In this way, they assume they can unveil universal laws about social relations, which will lead to true knowledge. Based on this, correct social policies can be formulated. Thus, social processes are excluded, while scientific objective facts are included. Society is assumed a static entity, where no changes are possible. By promoting a permanent character, social science legitimizes the existing social order, while obscuring the relations of domination and subordination, which is keeping the existing power relations inaccessible to analysis. The frozen order also makes it impossible to develop alternative explanations about social reality. It prevents a historical and political understanding of reality and denies the possibility for social transformation by human agency. The prevailing condition is seen as an unavoidable fact. This implies that human beings are passive and that domination is a natural force, for which no one is responsible. This permits the state freely to implement laws and policies, which are controlling and coercive. These are seen as being correct, because they are based on scientific facts made by scientific experts. One result is that the state, without consulting the public, engages in a pathological pursuit of economic growth. Technology can be used to dominate societies or to enhance them. Thus both science and technology could have developed in a different direction. But due to patriarchal values infiltrated in science the type of technology developed is meant to dominate, oppress, exploit and kill. One reason is that patriarchal societies identify masculinity with conquest. Thus any technical innovation will continue to be a tool for more effective oppression and exploitation. The highest priority seems to be given to technology that destroys life. Modern societies are dominated by masculine institutions and patriarchal ideologies. Their technologies prevailed in Auschwitz, Dresden, Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Vietnam, Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan and in many other parts of the world. Patriarchal power has brought us acid rain, global warming, military states, poverty and countless cases of suffering. We have seen men whose power has caused them to lose all sense of reality, decency and imagination, and we must fear such power. The ultimate result of unchecked patriarchy will be ecological catastrophe and nuclear holocaust. Such actions are denial of wisdom. It is working against natural harmony and destroying the basis of existence. But as long as ordinary people leave questions of technology to the "experts" we will continue the forward stampede. As long as economics focus on technology and both are the focus of politics, we can leave none of them to experts. Ordinary people are often more capable of taking a wider and more humanistic view than these experts. (Kelly 1990: 112-114; Eisler 1990: 3233; Schumacher 1993: 20, 126, 128, 130).

#### 8. Discourse of “not fighting back” justifies rape culture in the military – self defense is justified in certain instances

#### 9. US military power is objectively and empirically good – prevents war, extinction

Barnett 11 (Thomas P.M. Barnett, Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College American military geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat., worked as the Assistant for Strategic Futures in the Office of Force Transformation in the Department of Defense, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” March 7 <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads>)

It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II. Let me be more blunt: As the guardian of globalization, the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation. But the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace. We introduced the international liberal trade order known as globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts. That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come. To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization -- one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism. America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding. As a result, the vector of structure-building connectivity shifted from trans-Atlantic to trans-Pacific. But if the connectivity push of the past several decades has been from West to East, with little connectivity extended to the South outside of the narrow trade of energy and raw materials, the current connectivity dynamic is dramatically different. Now, the dominant trends are: first, the East cross-connecting back to the West via financial and investment flows as well as Asian companies "going global"; and second, the East creating vast new connectivity networks with the South through South-South trade and investment. The challenge here is how to adjust great-power politics to these profound forces of structural change. Because of the West's connectivity to the East, we are by extension becoming more deeply connected to the unstable South, with China as the primary conduit. Meanwhile, America's self-exhausting post-Sept. 11 unilateralist bender triggered the illusion -- all the rage these days -- of a G-Zero, post-American world. The result, predictably enough for manic-depressive America, is that we've sworn off any overall responsibility for the South, even as we retain the right to go anywhere and kill any individuals -- preferably with flying robots -- that we deem immediately threatening to our narrowly defined national security interests. The problem with this approach is that China has neither the intention nor the ability to step up and play anything resembling a responsible Leviathan over the restive South, where globalization's advance -- again, with a Chinese face -- produces a lot of near-term instability even as it builds the basis for longer-term stability.

#### 9. Endorsing equity in combat does not necessitate militarism – inclusion doesn’t have to be “good” for it to be right

Stachowitsch 13 (Saskia Stachowitsch, post-doctoral research fellow and lecturer at the Department of Political Science at the University of Vienna, February 19, 2013, “Feminism and the Current Debates on Women in Combat,” e-International Relations, http://www.e-ir.info/2013/02/19/feminism-and-the-current-debates-on-women-in-combat/ //nimo)

Feminist disagreements over these issues will go on and likely never be settled. Meanwhile, a rights-based approach might still be the safest bet for those wishing to make a non-militaristic point for military gender integration. While some may not perceive the ‘right’ to fight, kill, and die as a desirable objective, focusing on equal access to important state institutions is preferable to arguments that women can fulfil placatory functions in the military or provide the social skills that men lack. Women should not be required to prove that they can do anything ‘better’ than men or bring any specific qualities to military and other institutions to be allowed to participate.¶ In conclusion, there is no easy, straightforward answer to journalists’ questions about the normative evaluation of women’s integration into ground-combat. In the light of feminist research in the areas of military, war, security, foreign policy, and international institutions, we can only conclude that full integration does not need to be ‘good’ for it to be right.

#### Obsession with words finds offense where none is intended

Fairman 10

Christopher M. Fairman is a professor at the Moritz College of Law at Ohio State University

The Washington Post February 14, 2010 **:** Saying it is hurtful. Banning it is worse.

While the N-word endures as an insult, it is so stigmatized that its use is no longer tolerated in public discourse. This is a positive step for us all, of course, but its containment does not come without costs. As **Harvard law professor Randall Kennedy described** in his 2002 book on the subject, stigmatizing **the word has elicited new problems, including an overeagerness to detect insult where none is intended and the use of excessively harsh punishment against those who use the word wrongly. I've coined a term for overzealous or extreme responses to insulting words: "word fetish."** Those under the influence of word fetish aren't content to refrain from using a certain word; they are set on eradicating any use by others. A classic example was the plight of David Howard, a white employee in the D.C. mayor's office in 1999. Howard told staff members that because of budget cuts, he would have to be "niggardly" with available funds. Wrongly believing "niggardly" was a variation of the N-word, black subordinates lobbied for his resignation. Howard ultimately resigned after public protests, though he was soon reinstated. If the campaign against "retard" is successful, an identical risk of word fetish exists. (Imagine that Emanuel had spoken of "retarding the opposition" -- would that be unacceptable?)

#### Experts agree – its absurd to say language controls thought

Faccone 2K

Claudia Faccone, Robert Kearns, Ashley Kopp, Elizabeth Watson April 19, 2000

The Effects of Language on Thought http://www.unc.edu/~jdumas/projects/languagethought.htm

**Linguistic relativity refers to "**the assertion that **the speakers of different languages have differing cognitive systems,"** and that these different systems have an influence on the ways in which the speakers, of the worlds many languages, think about the world (Sternberg, 1999). **Most simply, language shapes thought**. Often referred to as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis of linguistic determinism, it states that people’s thoughts are determined by the categories made available by their language. A more moderate idea is that of linguistic relativity (differences among languages cause differences in the thoughts of their speakers—thus, thought is the functional equivalent of language.) According to Steven **Pinker (**1994), **one of the world’s leading experts on language and the mind,** the implications of the above hypothesis are dramatic; "the foundational categories of reality are not ‘in’ the world but are imposed by one’s culture (and hence can be challenged…)." Attempts to support the idea of relativity are derived from various studies based on the assumptions that¶ "Languages carve the spectrum into color words at different places," ¶ There is a "fundamentally different Hopi concept of time" ¶ There are "dozens of Eskimo words for snow" (1994)¶ However, Pinker would argue that this is not sufficient evidence. In fact, he **thinks** **it is completely absurd. A more logical explanation for the correlation, if any, between thoughts and language relies on a theory of universality.**