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**The 1ac relies on a fundamental assumption of what a veteran is – they say that one who goes through “war” is a veteran. This, however, always necessitates answering the question: “what is war?” Unlike the 1ac, we acknowledge that we are all in a constant state of militarism. Calls to this state of “war” are what allow all other forms of militarism to go unnoticed**

**Cuomo 1996** – PhD, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Department of Philosophy, University of Cincinnati (Chris, Hypatia Fall 1996. Vol. 11, Issue 3, pg 30)

In "Gender and `Postmodern' War," Robin Schott introduces some of the ways in which war is currently best seen not as an event but as a presence (Schott 1995). Schott argues that postmodern understandings of persons, states, and politics, as well as the high-tech nature of much contemporary warfare and the preponderance of civil and nationalist wars, render an eventbased conception of war inadequate, especially insofar as gender is taken into account. In this essay, I will expand upon her argument by showing that accounts of war that only focus on events are impoverished in a number of ways, and therefore feminist consideration of the political, ethical, and ontological dimensions of war and the possibilities for resistance demand a much more complicated approach. I take Schott's characterization of war as presence as a point of departure, though I am not committed to the idea that the constancy of militarism, the fact of its omnipresence in human experience, and the paucity of an event-based account of war are exclusive to contemporary postmodern or postcolonial circumstances.(1) Theory that does not investigate or even notice the **omnipresence of militarism** cannot represent or address the depth and specificity of the everyday effects of militarism on women, on people living in occupied territories, on members of military institutions, and on the environment. These effects are relevant to feminists in a number of ways because military practices and institutions help construct gendered and national identity, and because they justify the destruction of natural nonhuman entities and communities **during peacetime.** Lack of attention to these aspects of the business of making or preventing military violence in an extremely technologized world **results in theory that cannot accommodate the connections** among the constant presence of militarism, declared wars, and other closely related social phenomena, such as nationalistic glorifications of motherhood, media violence, and current ideological gravitations to military solutions for social problems. Ethical approaches that do not attend to the ways in which warfare and military practices are woven into the very fabric of life in twenty-first century technological states **lead to crisis-based politics and analyses**. For any feminism that aims to resist oppression and create alternative social and political options, crisis-based ethics and politics are problematic because they **distract attention** from the need for sustained resistance to the enmeshed, omnipresent systems of domination and oppression that so often function as givens in most people's lives. Neglecting the omnipresence of militarism allows the **false belief** that the **absence of declared armed conflicts is peace**, the polar opposite of war. It is particularly easy for those whose lives are shaped by the safety of privilege, and who do not regularly encounter the realities of militarism, to maintain this false belief. The belief that militarism is an ethical, political concern only regarding armed conflict, **creates forms of resistance** to militarism that are merely e**xercises in crisis control.** Antiwar resistance is then mobilized when the "real" violence finally occurs, or when the stability of privilege is directly threatened, and at that point it is difficult not to respond in ways that make resisters drop all other political priorities. Crisis-driven attention to declarations of war might actually **keep resisters complacent about and complicitous in the general presence of global militarism**. Seeing war as necessarily embedded in constant military presence draws attention to the fact that horrific, state-sponsored violence is happening nearly all over, all of the time, and that it is perpetrated by military institutions and other militaristic agents of the state. **Moving away from crisis-driven politics and ontologies** concerning war and military violence also **enables consideration** of relationships among seemingly disparate phenomena, and therefore can shape more nuanced theoretical and practical forms of resistance. For example, investigating the ways in which war is part of a presence allows consideration of the relationships among the events of war and the following: how militarism is a foundational trope in the social and political imagination; how the pervasive presence and symbolism of soldiers/warriors/patriots shape meanings of gender; the ways in which threats of state-sponsored violence are a sometimes invisible/sometimes bold agent of racism, nationalism, and corporate interests; the fact that vast numbers of communities, cities, and nations are currently in the midst of excruciatingly violent circumstances. It also provides a lens for considering the relationships among the various kinds of violence that get labeled "war." Given current American obsessions with nationalism, guns, and militias, and growing hunger for the death penalty, prisons, and a more powerful police state, one cannot underestimate the need for philosophical and political attention to connections among phenomena like the "war on drugs," the "war on crime," and other state-funded militaristic campaigns. I propose that the constancy of militarism and its effects on social reality be reintroduced as a crucial locus of contemporary feminist attentions, and that feminists emphasize how wars are eruptions and manifestations of omnipresent militarism that is a product and tool of multiply oppressive, corporate, technocratic states.(2) Feminists should be particularly interested in making this shift because it better allows consideration of the effects of war and militarism on women, subjugated peoples, and environments. While giving attention to the constancy of militarism in contemporary life we need not neglect the importance of addressing the specific qualities of direct, large-scale, declared military conflicts. But the dramatic nature of declared, large-scale conflicts should not obfuscate the ways in which military violence pervades most societies in increasingly technologically sophisticated ways and the significance of military institutions and everyday **practices in shaping reality.** Philosophical discussions that focus only on the ethics of declaring and fighting wars miss these connections, and also miss the ways in which even declared military conflicts are often experienced as omnipresent horrors. These approaches also leave unquestioned tendencies to **suspend or distort moral judgement** in the face of what appears to be the inevitability of war and militarism.

**This raises the fundamental question of who is a veteran. This leads to the continuum of veteran-hood where those who don’t fir the exact definition of the 1ac is marked as irrelevant**

**Think Africa Press 12** welcomes inquiries regarding the republication of its articles. If you would like to republish this or any other article for re-print, syndication or educational purposes, please contact: editor@thinkafricapress.com http://thinkafricapress.com/mozambique/who-counts-veteran-renamo-frelimo

Nearly 20 years after the end of Mozambique’s civil war, debate about ex-combatant pensions and benefits are still heated in the capital Maputo. The discussion has centred on defining who counts as a ‘veteran’, which in a country that faced two devastating wars over the course of 30 years is a far from easy task.

The Statute of Veterans, passed in May 2011, is the latest attempt by the government to solve this dilemma and provide benefits to those who deserve them. What has developed is not a dichotomy of ex-combatant versus civilian, but instead a continuum of veteran-hood. Entitlement to benefits depends on which war a combatant participated in, for how long, and with which armed group.

Under the statute, veterans of Mozambique’s FRELIMO-led liberation war against Portugal (1964-75) are to receive a new “participation bonus” on top of their already existing minimum wage pensions. Veterans of Mozambique’s 16-year civil war (1977-92), however, are only offered a “social re-insertion bonus”, as long as they served for three years or more. This bonus is offered to both veterans from FRELIMO – the country’s ruling socialist party since independence in 1975 – or RENAMO – the country’s political opposition party, but what was initially a militant rebel group funded by Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) then apartheid South Africa.

Missing links?

While providing unprecedented benefits to combatants of both wars, the statute has been opposed strongly by RENAMO representatives who claim it discriminates against their ex-combatants by providing higher benefits to FRELIMO fighters who fought in Mozambique’s liberation war.

More controversially, RENAMO has opposed the statute provision that means only years of fighting after an ex-combatant’s 14th birthday count. This suggests that, contrary to RENAMO’s previous assertions, the group recruited fighters younger than 14.

RENAMO’s cries of exclusion, however, have not been the only or even the loudest within the debate. After the statute was passed, much of the discourse has been pushed by Herminio dos Santos, president of the National Forum of Demobilised Soldiers (Fórum dos Desmobilizados de Guerra de Moçambique), who has campaigned for higher pensions and a broader definition of those entitled to veteran benefits.

Dos Santos has led several protests in Maputo and has been detained by police just as often. One of his main points of contention with the benefit scheme is the exclusion of peasant militia fighters, known as Naparamas, who fought alongside the government army against RENAMO. While they were never officially accounted for, activists claim there are nearly 22,000 of these ex-combatants being ignored by the government.

Fruitless negotiations

On March 12, Herminio dos Santos and his supporters were finally able to meet with Mateus Kida, Minister for Veteran Affairs, to discuss potential improvements to the veteran benefit system. In addition to the recognition of Naparamas as veterans, Dos Santos pushed for an overall increase in pensions to all ex-combatants to around 12,000 meticals a month ($440), nearly 6 times the national minimum wage set for agricultural workers.

These and other requests were dismissed by Minister Kida, who claimed he would not have agreed to the meeting were he previously aware of them. 14 other demobilised associations also distanced themselves from the proposals and have backed away from Dos Santos’ attempts to engender a redefinition of veterans through demonstrations.

Successful reintegration?

The fervent debate around ex-combatant benefits over the past few years questions the success of Mozambique’s reintegration process twenty years ago, which had heavy international involvement and was widely regarded as exemplary.

While it may seem farfetched to link the current debate on veteran benefits to reintegration programmes that started two decades ago, their impact has undoubtedly shaped today’s discourse. Like the recent statute, for example, the reintegration programmes excluded the thousands of militia fighters Herminio Dos Santos is now representing.

Widely funded and composed of varying initiatives and methods of reintegration, Mozambique’s security reform was widely declared a success in that it prevented a large-scale return to violence after the 1992 peace agreement. However, in doing so, it arguably retained more of a ‘negative peace’ in which wide-scale violence was absent, as opposed to ‘positive peace’ with reconciliation and prosperity.

**This is a form of linguistic violence. Even if the 1ac is a nonviolent discourse, it has the possibility of being positive or negative. Claiming “war” as an isolated event and not evaluating how “war” happens every day is a choice. It is through this that we can prioritize “war” over everyday events and allow ruptures in our social space where we say that “non-veterans don’t matter.”**

**Gay 98** William C Gay. Ph.D. in Philosophy from Boston College, Prof. UNC, Peace Review, Dec 1998.Vol.10, Iss. 4; pg. 545-8

Many times the first step in reducing linguistic violence is to simply refrain from the use of offensive and oppressive terms. However, just because linguistic violence is not being used**, a genuinely pacific discourse** is not necessarily present. Nonviolent discourse, like the condition of peace, can be negative or positive. "Negative peace" refers to the temporary absence of actual war or the lull between wars, while "positive peace" refers to the negation of war and the presence of justice. The pacific discourse that is analogous to negative peace can actually perpetuate injustice. Broadcasters in local and national news may altogether avoid using terms like "dyke" or "fag" or even "homosexual," but they and their audiences can remain homophobic even when the language of lesbian and gay pride is used. A government may cease referring to a particular nation as "a rogue state," but public and private attitudes may continue to foster prejudice toward this nation and its inhabitants. When prejudices remain unspoken, at least in public forums, **their detection and eradication are made even more difficult.** Of course, we need to find ways to restrain hate speech in order to at least stop linguistic attacks in the public arena. Likewise, we need to find ways to restrain armed conflicts and hostile name calling directed against an adversary of the state. However, even if avoidance of linguistic violence is necessary, it is not sufficient. Those who bite their tongues to comply with the demands of political correctness **are often ready to lash out vitriolic epithets when these constraints are removed**. Thus, the practice of linguistic nonviolence is more like negative peace when the absence of hurtful or harmful terminology merely marks a lull in reliance on linguistic violence or a shift of its use from the public to the private sphere. The merely public or merely formal repression of language and behavior that expresses these attitudes **builds up pressure that can erupt in subsequent outbursts of linguistic** violence **and physical violence**. Pacific discourse that is analogous to positive peace facilitates and reflects the move from a lull in the occurrence of violence to its negation. The establishment of a genuinely pacific discourse that is analogous to positive peace requires a transformation of cultures oriented to violence and war. It also requires a commitment to the active pursuit of domestic and global justice. **Efforts to establish a practice of linguistic nonviolence analogous to positive peace are part of a larger struggle to reduce cultural violence**. They advance the quest for societies in which human emancipation, dignity, and respect are not restricted on the basis of irrelevant factors like race, gender, class, or sexual orientation. Correlative to the distinction between negative and positive peace is the distinction between coercive and nonviolent methods of advancing pacific discourse. Just as I advocate pacifism as the proper response to the physical violence of war, so I advocate pacific discourse as the proper response to linguistic violence. Some people do not think war can be eliminated. The term "warism" refers to taking war for granted, and ample evidence exists for challenging this assumption. Others think that insofar as national security is to be defended, the use of military force cannot be avoided. I am among those who maintain that a nonviolent model of national security is feasible. Likewise, some people do not think that language as currently structured can be changed. This view is termed "linguistic institutionalism" or "linguistic determinism," and ample evidence is also available for challenging this assumption. Others think that insofar as the violence of language is to be countered, force will have to be exercised. I am also among those who maintain that holding fast to linguistic nonviolence as a means is as important as aiming for linguistic nonviolence as a goal. Hate speech can be prevented through legal or physical coercion. Likewise, politically correct discourse can be achieved through legal or even physical coercion. The use of legal or physical coercion to end hate speech or establish politically correct discourse entails the abandonment of nonviolence. When people are silenced by the threat posed in the words of law or by the constraint imposed through the deeds of authorities, verbally or physically violent means have been employed. By contrast, individuals can intentionally choose to eschew hate speech and to use politically correct discourse. They also can use linguistically nonviolent tactics to persuade others to do so as well. From a pacifist perspective or, even more generally, from a nonviolent perspective, much discourse that calls for an end to violence and war or that calls for the establishment of peace and social justice actually places a primacy on ends over means. When the end is primary, nonviolence may be practiced only so long as it is effective. For the pacifist and the practitioner of nonviolence, the primary commitment is to the means. The commitment to nonviolence requires that the achievement of political goals is secondary. Political goals must be foregone or at least postponed when they cannot be achieved nonviolently. Various activities promote the pursuit of the respect, cooperation and understanding needed for positive peace and social justice and for the genuinely pacific discourse that is an integral part of them. Linguistically, these activities go beyond the mere removal from discourse of terms that convey biases based on race, gender, class, and sexual orientation. Open dialogue, especially face-to-face conversation, is one of the most effective ways of experiencing that the other is not so alien or alienating. Beyond having political leaders of various nations meet, we need cultural and educational exchanges, as well as trade agreements among businesses and foreign travel by citizens. We can come to regard cultural diversity in the expression of race, gender, class, and sexual orientation as making up the harmonies and melodies that together create the song of humanity. Just as creative and appreciated cooks use a wide variety of herbs and spices to keep their dishes from being bland, so too can we move from an image of a culture with diverse components as in a melting pot to one of a stew that is well seasoned with a variety of herbs and spices. A pacific discourse that expresses such an affirmation of diversity needs to be an understood language of inclusion. While linguistic violence often relies on authoritarian, monological, aggressive and calculative methods, a positively nonviolent discourse is democratic, dialogical, receptive, and mediative. A positively nonviolent discourse is not passive in the sense of avoiding engagement; it is pacific in the sense of seeking to actively build, from domestic to international levels, lasting peace and justice. A positively nonviolent discourse provides a way of perceiving and communicating that frees us to the diversity and open-endedness of life rather than the sameness and senselessness of violence. A positively nonviolent discourse can provide the communicative means to overcome linguistic violence that does not contradict or compromise its goal at any point during its pursuit. The first step is breaking our silence concerning the many forms of violence. **We need to recognize that often silence is violence**; frequently, **unless we break the silence, we are being complicitous to the violence of the situation**. However, in breaking the silence, our aim should be to avoid counter-violence, in its physical forms and in its verbal forms. Efforts to advance peace and justice should occupy the space between silence and violence. Linguistic violence can be overcome, but the care and vigilance of the positive practice of physical and linguistic nonviolence is needed if the gains are to be substantive, rather than merely formal, and if the goals of nonviolence are to be equally operative in the means whereby we overcome linguistic violence and social injustice.
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#### What is war and who is a soldier? The distinction between veterans and civilians is not as clear cut as the 1AC makes it out to be -- PTSD in prison gaurds proves

Lennard, ’12 [Natasha, Salon. “31 percent of correctional officers have PTSD” http://www.salon.com/2012/12/04/31\_percent\_of\_correctional\_officers\_have\_ptsd/]

While post traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) is commonly associated with soldiers returning from combat, a recent study illustrates that domestic sites of trauma regularly produce PTSD in emergency service first responders and, above all, prison guards. Thirty-one percent of U.S. correctional security officers suffer from PTSD, according to a report from Desert Waters Correctional Outreach — a nonprofit dedicated to corrections professionals’ well-being.

The most recent National Comorbidity Study asserted that the prevalence of PTSD in the general population in 3.5 percent — nearly 10 times less prevalent than in prison security guards. 14.3 percent of New York firefighters were found to suffer from PTSD — a prevalence rate nearly half that of correctional officers. A National Institutes of Health study from 2009 put the prevalence rate of PTSD in Iraq war veterans (20 percent) below that of prison security officers.

Participants in the Desert Waters study responded to questions indicating the degree to which they witnessed or experienced incidents of workplace violence, injury and death (VID) and related emotions such as depression and anxiety. Participants also responded to questions about health-related behaviors and conditions, and functioning.

Although the study was undertaken with the health and safety concerns of prison workers as its primary goal, its findings highlight the extent to which prisons in the U.S. function as sites of extreme trauma, producing comparable rates of PTSD as war zones.

“Corrections environments represent uniquely unsafe workplaces due to repeated exposure to trauma, compared to most occupations. While not widely recognized, corrections professionals are exposed to the same types of VID-related events as are emergency responders and war-time military personnel, and they are potentially exposed to even more life-threatening experiences than law enforcement personnel over time,” the study noted.

#### We should listen to and acknowledge the veteran – but that’s not a reason to vote aff or unconditionally affirm the voices of veterans –

1. Difference among veterans makes affirmation incoherent – Vietnam vets

The aff

2. Some veteran stories should be listened to but not affirmed

Affirmation doesn’t mean

Voting neg affirms the ability of voice – the aff should defend a particular content

#### **Distance war – 1AC cross-x said veterans are people who are deployed overseas for three years – this ignores how technology is changing the way that war functions –**

Zucchino, ’12 [David, LA Times, “Stress of combat reaches drone crews”. http://www.stripes.com/stress-of-combat-reaches-drone-crews-1.171999]

Only rarely do drone crews fire on the enemy. The rest of the time, they sit and watch. For hours on end. Day after day.

It can get monotonous and, yes, boring.

It can also be gut-wrenching.

Crews sometimes see ground troops take casualties or come under attack. They zoom in on enemy dead to confirm casualties. Psychologically, they're in the middle of combat. But physically most of them are on another continent, which can lead to a sense of helplessness.

"That lack of control is one of the main features of producing stress," said Air Force Col. Hernando Ortega, who discussed results of a survey of Predator and Reaper crews at a recent conference in Washington, D.C. They ask themselves, he said: "Could I have done better? Did I make the right choices?"

The Air Force is only now becoming aware of the toll — which Air Force psychologists call combat stress — posed by drone crews' job, even as the drone workload is growing.

In recent years, the Air Force has trained more drone pilots than conventional pilots, and the Pentagon is increasingly relying on drones to fight wars and terrorism overseas. Drone crews flew 54 combat air patrols a day over and Iraq last year, up from five a day in 2004. The goal is 65 patrols a day by 2013.

The military is changing its terminology accordingly. What the Air Force used to call UAVs, for unmanned aerial vehicles, are now called RPAs, for remotely piloted aircraft.

"They are not unmanned at all," Ortega said. "They're manned to the hilt."

In civilian jobs, the pressures of working long hours on staggered shifts are wearing enough. But with drone missions, one miscalculation can prove fatal.

Last April, two U.S. Marines were accidentally killed by Predator fire, and at least 15 Afghan civilians died in a mistaken attack by a Predator and helicopter gunships in February 2010.

The Air Force considers drone crews "deployed'' in combat, even though most of them fly planes from U.S. bases. "The most dangerous part of their day is their commute,'' said Peter W. Singer, a Brookings Institution scholar who studies robotics in warfare.

Crews must shift repeatedly between home and combat. "A Predator pilot told me: 'I'm spending 12 hours fighting enemy combatants, and 20 minutes later I'm talking to my kids about homework,'" Singer said.

The three-member crews typically work 12-hour shifts. They monitor the landscape and events on the ground — what the Air Force calls ISR, for intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance — often through the early-morning hours.

"Humans don't work well at 3 in the morning … we're not nocturnal," said Ortega, a flight surgeon. "And that builds fatigue, which decreases human performance, which leads to more stress."

"It's really kind of a boring job ... it's kind of terrible," Ortega said, paraphrasing comments from the survey.

At the same time, the crews can develop strong emotional bonds with ground troops via text messages and radio, Ortega said. "These guys actually telecommute to the war zone," he said. "The band of brothers is built online."

That contributes to the sense of helplessness when their colleagues are in physical danger.

"There can be guilt even if no shot is fired, just from the fact that you don't feel you can help," said Col. Kent McDonald, an Air Force psychiatrist who helped conduct the recent survey of 900 drone crew members in 2010 and 2011.

In the survey, 46% of active-duty drone pilots reported high levels of stress, and 29% reported emotional exhaustion or burnout. The data included Air Force crews who have flown drones over Iraq and Afghanistan, but not crews who fly drones over Pakistan, Yemen and Somalia as part of CIA programs.

Active-duty sensor operators, who operate camera and surveillance gear, reported high-stress rates of 41% and burnout rates of 21%. Mission intelligence coordinators, who are often separated from pilots and sensor operators, reported high-stress rates of 39% and burnout rates of 20%.

By comparison, a recent Families and Work Institute study found that 26% of civilian workers were "often or very often burned out or stressed by their work," and a Yale University study found that 29% of workers felt "quite a bit or extremely stressed at work."

Combat stress puts many drone crew members at high risk forpost-traumatic stress disorder, Air Force psychologists say, though no pilots and only a couple of camera operators have been diagnosed with PTSD.

By comparison, between 11% and 20% of troops from Iraq and Afghanistan, including some Air Force crew members who fly conventional warplanes, have been diagnosed with PTSD, according to the National Center for PTSD.

At the very least, the stress leaves drone crews at risk for depression and anxiety disorders, potentially affecting their performance, psychologists say.

Often, crew members don't even acknowledge that they're stressed by combat. After all, they're not directly exposed to combat smells or sounds, or the imminent threat of death — all typically associated with PTSD in ground troops.

Crews who feel stress don't say it's "because I was in combat or because we had to blow up a building or because we saw people get blown up," Ortega said. Rather, he said, they complain of shift work, schedule changes, long hours, low staffing and failure to maintain family relationships.

As one respondent complained: "Sustaining vigilance is mind-numbing." Others wrote: "Too much monotony/Groundhog Day" and "Not being around to do stuff at home."

The Air Force is considering assigning more chaplains and psychologists to drone units, said Dr. Wayne Chappelle, an Air Force clinical psychologist. It's also considering workshops on family stresses, and adding psychologists to military clinics so that crew members don't have to be referred to outside specialists.

Combat stress needs to be addressed before it affects crew performance, Chappelle said.

Crew members may not be able to escape combat stress, Ortega said.

"This is a different kind of war, but it's still war," he said. "And they do internally feel it."