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### 2AC Circumvention

#### Congressional opposition to the authority curbs Presidential action – robust statistical and empirical proof

KRINER 10 Assistant professor of political science at Boston University [Douglas L. Kriner, “After the Rubicon: Congress, Presidents, and the Politics of Waging War”, page 228-231]

Conclusion

The sequence of events leading up to the sudden reversal of administration policy and the dramatic withdrawal of U.S. Marines from Lebanon clearly demonstrates that open congressional opposition to Reagan's conduct of the mission in Beirut was critically important in precipitating the change in course. By tracing the pathways of congressional in- fluence, the case study achieves two important objectives. First, it vividly illustrates Congress's capacity to influence the scope and duration of a use of force independent of major shifts in public opinion and changing conditions on the ground. The analysis makes clear that there was no dramatic shift in public opinion after the Beirut barracks bombing that compelled the Reagan administration to withdraw the Marines; in fact, in the wake of the attack the public rallied behind the president. As such, opponents of Reagan's policies in Congress initially fought against the tide of public opinion, and the modest decline in popular support for the president's handling of the Lebanon mission occurred only after a sustained campaign against the deployment on Capitol Hilt.89 Similarly, the administration's own internal analysis of the situation in early January 1984 makes clear that changing conditions on the ground did not necessitate a dramatic change in the nature of the Marine mission. Indeed, by the National Security Council's own estimate, some conditions in the region were actually improving. Instead, administration officials repeatedly emphasized domestic pressures to curtail the scope and duration of the Marine mission.90 Moreover, as the political and military situation in Lebanon worsened in late January and early February 1984, it is interesting that a number of key administration officials publicly and privately believed that there was a direct link between congressional opposition at home and the deterioration of the situation on the ground in the Middle East.

Second, the case study illustrates how the formal and informal congressional actions examined in the statistical analyses of chapter 4 affected presidential decision-making through the proposed theoretical mechanisms for congressional influence over presidential conduct of military affairs developed in chapter 2. Vocal opposition to the president in Congress-expressed through hearings and legislative initiatives to curtail presidential authority, and the visible defection from the White House of a number of prominent Republicans and erstwhile Democratic allies-raised the political stakes of staying the course in Lebanon. Nothing shook Reagan's basic belief in the benefits to be gained from a strong, defiant stand in Beirut. But the political pressure generated by congressional opposition to his policies on both sides of the aisle raised the likely political costs of obtaining these policy benefits. Congressional opposition also influenced the Reagan administration's decision-making indirectly by affecting its estimate of the military costs that would have to be paid to achieve American objectives. In the final analysis, through both the domestic political costs and signaling mechanisms discussed in chapter 2 , congressional opposition contributed to the administration's ultimate judgment that the benefits the United States might reap by continuing the Marine mission no longer outweighed the heightened political and military costs necessary to obtain them.

Finally, while the Marine mission in Lebanon is admittedly but one case, it is a case that many in the Reagan administration believed had important implications for subsequent military policymaking. In a postmortem review, Don Fortier of the National Security Council and Steve Sestanovich at the State Department warned that the debacle in Lebanon raised the possibility that, in the future, the decision to use force might be akin to an all-or-nothing decision. "If the public and Congress reject any prolonged U.S. role (even when the number of troops is small)," the administration analysts lamented, "we will always be under pressure to resolve problems through briefer, but more massive involvements-or to do nothing at all." Thus, from the administration's "conspicuously losing to the Congress" over Lebanon policy, Fortier and Sestanovich argued that the White House would have to anticipate costly congressional opposition if similar actions were launched in the future and adjust its conduct of military operations accordingly, with the end result being a "narrowing of options" on the table and more "limited flexibility" when deploying major contingents of American military might abroad.91 This last point echoes the first anticipatory mechanism posited in chapter 2, and reminds us that Congress need not overtly act to rein in a military action of which it disapproves for it to have an important influence on the scope and duration of a major military endeavor. Rather, presidents, having observed Congress's capacity to raise the political and tangible costs of a given course of military action, may anticipate the likelihood of congressional opposition and adjust their conduct of military operations accordingly.

### China Politics

#### CCP instability is key to Chinese democratization—pressure will trigger limited democratic reforms—these will snowball into full democracy.

Waldron 4—Arthur Waldron, Senior Fellow of Foreign Policy Research Institute and the Lauder Professor of International Relations at the University of Pennsylvania [Spring 2004, “Democratization and Greater China: How Would Democracy Change China?” Orbis, www.fpri.org/orbis/4802/waldron.democracychangechina.pdf]

More surprisingly, Hu has at least paid lip service to democracy for the citizenry as well. On the eve of National Day, October 1, he made a speech that asserted: ‘‘We must enrich the forms of democracy, make democratic procedures complete, expand citizens’ orderly political participa- tion and ensure that the people can exercise democratic elections, democratic decision making, democratic administration, and democratic scrutiny.’’18 Why is Hu saying this? Other Chinese have been forthright in their demands that their country adopt what journalists still often refer to as Western-style democracy—even though Japan, India, South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, and other Asian states have democratic lineages in many cases far longer than many of the West’s ‘‘new democracies.’’ Thus, on the eve of a Party meeting called for mid-October to discuss amending the constitution, the respected Beijing constitutional scholar and economist Cao Siyuan published China’s Constitution Revision—Protect Everyone’s Legal Rights, which he sent to every member of the Politburo. In it he advocates immediate steps to discard Marxist rhetoric, give priority to citizens’ rights, and enforce the presumption of innocence in court proceedings. He urges holding direct elections at all levels, empowering local and provincial legislatures, privatizing the media, and guaranteeing freedom of speech, press, and religion.19 The immediate ofﬁcial response to these suggestions was to place Cao under 24-hour security police surveillance (now lifted). Almost simultaneously with Cao’s calls came news that an experimental, directly elected community council may be envisaged for a Beijing neighborhood.20 Reporters did not expect a dramatic democratic breakthrough, but was this a straw in the wind? This is not to suggest that the Communist Party has changed its colors and is preparing to lead China through a transformation to democracy. But evidently the issue is alive in China and the Party is attempting to deal with it. Almost inevitably, that will lead to experiments in limited opening—and those, as we saw in the late 1980s and early 1990s, usually lead to far greater changes than their authors envisage. The reason that the Party is playing with democratic ﬁre is simple: popular pressure, at home and from the Chinese diaspora, and the knowledge within the political class that whoever succeeds in channeling into democratic institutions the aspirations and free-ﬂoating resentments of today’s China will emerge as a winner.

#### The transition will be stable.

Gilley 7—Bruce Gilley, Assistant professor of political studies at Queen's University in Canada, and former contributing editor at the Far Eastern Economic Review [January 2007, “Is China Stuck?” Journal of Democracy, 18.1, Project Muse]

Yet what if the CCP is actually quite responsive? What if it is in tune with popular demands, and finds ways to move and adapt as those demands change? In other words, what if the party stays or goes because of [End Page 173] popular pressures? Pei himself recognizes this possibility. He cites "rising public dissatisfaction" (p.14) as one thing that would prod the regime to change. "A democratic opening may emerge in the end, but not as a regime-initiated strategy undertaken at its own choosing, but more likely as the result of a sudden crisis" (p. 44). Perhaps the word crisis is being used in two different senses here. One crisis and another can, after all, vary in urgency: There are crises and there are crises. The crisis of which Pei speaks seems to be of the more benign sort, a mere shift in public preferences that prods the regime to change. Such a crisis will not require democracy to rise upon the ashes of a razed public square, but rather will stir the regime to recognize that its time has come, and to do the right thing by going fairly gentle into that good night. If so, then the prospects for a relatively smooth democratic transition in China are bright and no collapse is likely.

#### Prefer our evidence—western analysts often mistake progress towards democratization as a crisis in CCP leadership.

Sydney Morning Herald 8 [11/27/2008, “Outbreak of transparency,” http://www.smh.com.au/news/world/outbreak-of-transparency/2008/11/26/1227491636668.html]

A WAVE of protest and riots has spread across China, igniting debate over whether it shows rising political instability or a new tolerance for democracy. Official media, predominantly the Government's flagship Xinhua news agency, have promptly and prominently reported violent protests that began with thousands of taxi drivers in China's largest city, Chongqing, on November 3. The nationwide coverage appears to have encouraged taxi drivers, disgruntled land owners and laid-off workers to take to the streets in at least eight provinces. The Communist Party's Guangzhou Daily reported that 2000 toy factory workers had ransacked company offices and overturned a police car in Dongguan, a manufacturing city that has been badly hit by the global financial crisis. This week Guizhou, Hunan and Shaanxi provinces and the city of Shantou in Guangdong have also been rocked by mass unrest. Last night Xinhua quoted the Premier, Wen Jiabao, as telling a closed-door meeting of advisers: "Difficult times require more scientific and democratic decision-making". The report said Mr Wen had called for "strengthened democratic supervision". Some local governments appear to have legitimised the right to protest by acceding to demonstrators' demands. In Chongqing, the local government promised taxi drivers lower licence fees and stricter enforcement against unlicensed competitors following an audience with Chongqing's high-ranking party secretary, Bo Xilai. "In the old thinking, strikes meant instability," wrote Zhang Yongsheng, a researcher at the State Council's Development Research Centre, in an essay to be posted today on a blog affiliated with the Australian National University. "But actually strikes are a sign that Chinese society is becoming more and more open, transparent and democratic since the people can now protest publicly and the Government has to solve problems through reforming and disciplining their own behaviour." Mr Zhang said some Western media reports had mistaken progress towards democratisation for instability and even a crisis in Communist Party rule.

#### China key to global democracy—they bailout authoritarian regimes and prevent global consolidation.

Friedman 9—Edward Friedman, Professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, where he specializes in Chinese politics [Winter 2009, “China: A Threat to or Threatened by Democracy?” *Dissent* 56.1, Project Muse]

There is no other long-lasting basis for trustful cooperation with the government in Beijing than to accept the regime's legitimacy. CCP ruling groups imagine foreign democracy promotion as a threat to China's—and the world's—better future, identified, of course, as at one with the interests of CCP ruling groups. Can the world afford not to treat China as the superpower it is? The CCP imagines a chaotic and war-prone world disorder of American-led democracy-promotion being replaced by a beneficent Chinese world order of authoritarian growth with stability. There may be far less of a challenge to China from democracy than there is a challenge to democracy from China. Democracy-promoter Larry Diamond concludes in his recent book The Spirit of Democracy that democracy is in trouble across the world because of the rise of China, an authoritarian superpower that has the economic clout to back and bail out authoritarian regimes around the globe. "Singapore . . . could foreshadow a resilient form of capitalist-authoritarianism by China, Vietnam, and elsewhere in Asia," which delivers "booming development, political stability, low levels of corruption, affordable housing, and a secure pension system." Joined by ever richer and more influential petro powers leveraging the enormous wealth of Sovereign Investment Funds, "Asia will determine the fate of democracy," at least in the foreseeable future. Authoritarian China, joined by its authoritarian friends, is well on the way to defeating the global forces of democracy.

#### That’s key to prevent multiple scenarios for extinction.

Diamond 95—Larry Diamond, Senior fellow at the Hoover Institution [December 1995, “Promoting Democracy in the 1990s,” http://wwics.si.edu/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/1.htm]

On any list of the most important potential threats to world order and national security in the coming decade, these six should figure prominently: a hostile, expansionist Russia; a hostile, expansionist China; the spread of fundamentalist Islamic, anti-Western regimes; the spread of political terrorism from all sources; sharply increased immigration pressures; and ethnic conflict that escalates into large-scale violence, civil war, refugee flows, state collapse, and general anarchy. Some of these potential threats interact in significant ways with one another, but they all share a common underlying connection. In each instance, the development of democracy is an important prophylactic, and in some cases the only long- term protection, against disaster. A HOSTILE, EXPANSIONIST RUSSIA Chief among the threats to the security of Europe, the United States, and Japan would be the reversion of Russia--with its still very substantial nuclear, scientific, and military prowess--to a hostile posture toward the West. Today, the Russian state (insofar as it continues to exist) appears perched on the precipice of capture by ultranationalist, anti-Semitic, neo-imperialist forces seeking a new era of pogroms, conquest, and "greatness." These forces feed on the weakness of democratic institutions, the divisions among democratic forces, and the generally dismal economic and political state of the country under civilian, constitutional rule. Numerous observers speak of "Weimar Russia." As in Germany in the 1920s, the only alternative to a triumph of fascism (or some related "ism" deeply hostile to freedom and to the West) is the development of an effective democratic order. Now, as then, this project must struggle against great historical and political odds, and it seems feasible only with international economic aid and support for democratic forces and institutions. A HOSTILE, EXPANSIONIST CHINA In China, the threat to the West emanates from success rather than failure and is less amenable to explicit international assistance and inducement. Still, a China moving toward democracy--gradually constructing a real constitutional order, with established ground rules for political competition and succession and civilian control over the military--seems a much better prospect to be a responsible player on the regional and international stage. Unfair trade practices, naval power projection, territorial expansion, subversion of neighboring regimes, and bullying of democratic forces in Hong Kong and Taiwan are all more likely the more China resists political liberalization. So is a political succession crisis that could disrupt incremental patterns of reform and induce competing power players to take risks internationally to advance their power positions at home. A China that is building an effective rule of law seems a much better prospect to respect international trading rules that mandate protection for intellectual property and forbid the use of prison labor. And on these matters of legal, electoral, and institutional development, international actors can help. THE SPREAD OF ISLAMIC FUNDAMENTALISM Increasingly, Europeans and Americans worry about the threat from fundamentalist Islam. But fundamentalist movements do not mobilize righteous anger and absolute commitment in a vacuum. They feed on the utter failure of decadent political systems to meet the most elementary expectations for material progress and social justice. Some say the West must choose between corrupt, repressive regimes that are at least secular and pro-Western and Islamic fundamentalist regimes that will be no less repressive, but anti-Western. That is a false choice in Egypt today, as it was in Iran or Algeria--at least until their societies became so polarized as to virtually obliterate the liberal center. It is precisely the corruption, arrogance, oppression, and gross inefficacy of ruling regimes like the current one in Egypt that stimulate the Islamic fundamentalist alternative. Though force may be needed--and legitimate--to meet an armed challenge, history teaches that decadent regimes cannot hang on forever through force alone. In the long run, the only reliable bulwark against revolution or anarchy is good governance--and that requires far-reaching political reform. In Egypt and some other Arab countries, such reform would entail a gradual program of political liberalization that counters corruption, reduces state interference in the economy, responds to social needs, and gives space for moderate forces in civil society to build public support and understanding for further liberalizing reforms. In Pakistan and Turkey, it would mean making democracy work: stamping out corruption, reforming the economy, mobilizing state resources efficiently to address social needs, devolving power, guaranteeing the rights of ethnic and religious minorities, and--not least-- reasserting civilian control over the military. In either case, the fundamentalist challenge can be met only by moving (at varying speeds) toward, not away from, democracy. POLITICAL TERRORISM Terrorism and immigration pressures also commonly have their origins in political exclusion, social injustice, and bad, abusive, or tyrannical governance. Overwhelmingly, the sponsors of international terrorism are among the world's most authoritarian regimes: Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Sudan. And locally within countries, the agents of terrorism tend to be either the fanatics of antidemocratic, ideological movements or aggrieved ethnic and regional minorities who have felt themselves socially marginalized and politically excluded and insecure: Sri Lanka's Tamils, Turkey's Kurds, India's Sikhs and Kashmiris. To be sure, democracies must vigorously mobilize their legitimate instruments of law enforcement to counter this growing threat to their security. But a more fundamental and enduring assault on international terrorism requires political change to bring down zealous, paranoiac dictatorships and to allow aggrieved groups in all countries to pursue their interests through open, peaceful, and constitutional means. As for immigration, it is true that people everywhere are drawn to prosperous, open, dynamic societies like those of the United States, Canada, and Western Europe. But the sources of large (and rapid) immigration flows to the West increasingly tend to be countries in the grip of civil war, political turmoil, economic disarray, and poor governance: Vietnam, Cuba, Haiti, Central America, Algeria. And in Mexico, authoritarianism, corruption, and social injustice have held back human development in ways that have spawned the largest sustained flow of immigrants to any Western country--a flow that threatens to become a floodtide if the Zedillo government cannot rebuild Mexico's economy and societal consensus around authentic democatic reform. In other cases--Ethiopia, Sudan, Nigeria, Afghanistan--immigration to the West has been modest only because of the greater logistical and political difficulties. However, in impoverished areas of Africa and Asia more remote from the West, disarray is felt in the flows of refugees across borders, hardly a benign development for world order. Of course, population growth also heavily drives these pressures. But a common factor underlying all of these crisis-ridden emigration points is the absence of democracy. And, strikingly, populations grow faster in authoritarian than democratic regimes.4 ETHNIC CONFLICT Apologists for authoritarian rule--as in Kenya and Indonesia--are wont to argue that multiparty electoral competition breeds ethnic rivalry and polarization, while strong central control keeps the lid on conflict. But when multiple ethnic and national identities are forcibly suppressed, the lid may violently pop when the regime falls apart. The fate of Yugoslavia, or of Rwanda, dramatically refutes the canard that authoritarian rule is a better means for containing ethnic conflict. Indeed, so does the recent experience of Kenya, where ethnic hatred, land grabs, and violence have been deliberately fostered by the regime of President Daniel arap Moi in a desperate bid to divide the people and thereby cling to power. Overwhelmingly, theory and evidence show that the path to peaceful management of ethnic pluralism lies not through suppressing ethnic identities and superimposing the hegemony of one group over others. Eventually, such a formula is bound to crumble or be challenged violently. Rather, sustained interethnic moderation and peace follow from the frank recognition of plural identities, legal protection for group and individual rights, devolution of power to various localities and regions, and political institutions that encourage bargaining and accommodation at the center. Such institutional provisions and protections are not only significantly more likely under democracy, they are only possible with some considerable degree of democracy.5 OTHER THREATS This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness. LESSONS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY The experience of this century offers important lessons. Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments. They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.

#### Democracy key to public influence on environmental policy—that’s the key to preventing environmental destruction in China

Yue 6—Pan Yue, Deputy director of China's State Environmental Protection Administration (SEPA) [12/5/2006, “The environment needs public participation,” China Dialogue, http://www.chinadialogue.net/article/show/single/en/604-The-environment-needs-public-participation]

In China, environmental protection is an increasingly pressing issue. Not only are pollution and ecological degradation becoming ever more serious, but also people are more and more unsatisfied about the situation. The speed with which we are polluting the environment far outstrips our efforts to clean it up. Why is this? China has a large population but few resources, and our production and consumption methods are too out of date. But at the root of the problem lies a more significant cause -- the lack of public participation in China. The initial motivation for the world environmental protection movement came from the public, without their participation it would not exist. In 1962, the US marine biologist Rachel Carson published her landmark book, Silent Spring, which focused on the environmental and human costs of pesticide use. This was a starting point in the development of environmental protection. On April 22, 1970, 20 million Americans took part in environmental demonstrations across the US. “Earth Day” is still celebrated on that date, and was a major event in the development of modern environmental participation. Take Japan as an example; although the country faces a greater pressure on resources than China, it is a world leader in protecting the environment. Visitors to Japan in recent years are invariably impressed by the country’s clean environment. But Japan also experienced the serious social consequences of pollution midway through the last century, when it underwent large-scale industrialisation. In the 1960s, Japanese victims of pollution first brought lawsuits against the companies responsible for environmental degradation. Japan’s media began to investigate and report on environmental accidents. In many places, grass-roots environmental groups were founded to combat polluting industries. By 1970, 45% of Japanese citizens opposed economic development that did not take environmental protection into account, overwhelming the 33% who polled in favour of unrestricted economic growth. Electoral support for Japan’s Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) declined from 58% to 48% as a result. Broad public participation forced both the LDP and the Diet to take notice of the environmental and social effects of pollution. In 1967, Japan issued the Basic Law for Environmental Pollution Control, and enacted the Law for the Compensation of Pollution-Related Health Injuries in 1973. A series of other environmental rules and regulations were put into place in the following years. In particular, the Basic Law for the Recycling–based Society employs the concept of “environmental culture” to promote public awareness of environmental protection and its moral value. The law promotes the use of new energy sources and compulsory limits on the consumption of natural resources. It not only regulates waste output but also encourages recycling and the safe disposal of non-recyclable waste. In the past 10 years, Japan has become a recycling-based society which strikes a balance between environmental protection and economic growth. Their example can show us that resolving the problems of pollution needs both governmental and citizen engagement, and that public participation and a democratic legal system are important factors in environmental protection. In China, the major problem is that environmental protection laws are not strictly observed and implemented due to a lack of democratic legal mechanisms for public participation. As early as 1978, the government stated clearly that where serious pollution is occurring, if no measures are put in place to improve this for a long time, it will be established who is personally responsible, and the enterprise in question will be shut down. Financial penalties are also to be applied and legal action taken in serious cases. But in the past 20 years, how many polluters -- businesspeople or officials -- have ever been penalised? How many government policies that have caused pollution and ecological damage have ever been corrected? And to what extent are we following the sustainable development strategy that was put forward in 1992?

#### Chinese environmental destruction causes extinction.

Salon 97 [10/29/1997, “The real China threat,” http://www.salon.com/news/1997/10/29news.html]

China's environmental disaster threatens not only the Chinese people -- who are dying in the hundreds of thousands every year from staggering levels of air and water pollution -- but all humanity. With its gigantic population and booming economy, China can single-handedly guarantee that climate change, ozone depletion and other deadly hazards become a reality for people the world over. In the back of our minds, Americans may suspect that China is an environmental wasteland -- after all, we know what happened in the Soviet Union. But the truth has yet to be revealed in all its ghastly vividness, not least because of China's restrictions on foreign journalists. I recently spent six weeks traveling unmonitored throughout China, interviewing everyone from senior government officials and scientific experts to unpaid workers and newly prosperous peasants. Everywhere, it seemed, the land had been scalped, the water poisoned, the air made toxic and dark Five of the 10 most air-polluted cities in the world are in China, and one of every four deaths is caused by lung disease. Yet coal consumption will triple over the next 25 years, making China the world's leading greenhouse gas producer and all but dooming global efforts to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by the 60 to 80 percent recommended by U.N. scientists.

### 2AC Security

#### Securitizing cyber space is the ONLY way to prevent large scale cyber war – the alt can’t solve fast enough or change US doctrine – vulnerability creates a Unique need for it

Pickin 12 (Matthew, MA War Stuides – Kings College, “What is the securitization of cyberspace? Is it a problem?”, http://www.academia.edu/3100313/What\_is\_the\_securitization\_of\_cyberspace\_Is\_it\_a\_problem)

In evaluating whether securitization of cyberspace is a problem, it is very clear that securitization is a growing concern with many complications. There are many issues including privacy, regulation, surveillance, internet regulation and the growing tension in the international system. However, because the United States is a superpower contesting with other cyber-heavyweights such as Iran, Russia and China the issue will not be de-securitized in the short term. With the discovery and use of cyber-weapons, many states are in the process of making their own for defensive and offensive purposes. The government of the United States will not de-securitize the issue of cyberspace while there are rival states and groups which prove a threat to the national security agenda. These problems will continue to exist until there is no defensive agenda and the issue is de-securitized, for now securitization is a necessary evil.

#### C) Dissident IR -- politicization and critique reproduces sovereignty and exploitation. Only political action within international relations can break the shackles of global oppression

Agathangelou and Ling, 1997 (Anna M., Director of the Global Change Institute in Nicosia and Former Assistant Professor of Women’s Studies and Politics at Oberlin; L.H.M., Institute of Social Studies at the Hague, Studies in Political Economy, v54, Fall, p. 7-8)

Yet, ironically if not tragically, dissident IR also paralyzes itself into non-action. While it challenges the status quo, dissident IR fails to transform it. Indeed, dissident IR claims that a “coherent” paradigm or research program – even an alternative one – reproduces the stifling parochialism and hidden power-mongering of sovereign scholarship “Any agenda of global politics informed by critical social theory perspectives”, write Jim George “must forgo the simple, albeit self-gratifying, options inherent in ready-made alternative Realisms and confront the dangers, closures, paradoxes, and complicities associated with them.” Even references to a “real world”, dissidents argue, repudiate the very meaning of dissidence given their sovereign presumption of a universalizable, testable Reality. What dissident scholarship opts for, instead, is a sense of disciplinary crisis that “resonates with the effects of marginal and dissident movements in all sorts of other localities.” Despite its emancipatory intentions, this approach effectively leaves the prevailing prison of sovereignty intact. It doubly incarcerates when dissident IR highlights the layers of power that oppress without offering a heuristic, not to mention a program, for emancipatory action. Merely politicizing the supposedly non-political neither guides emancipatory action nor guards it against demagoguery. At best, dissident IR sanctions a detached criticality rooted (ironically) in Western modernity. Michael Shapiro, for instance, advises the dissident theorist to take “a critical distance” or “position offshore” from which to “see the possibility of change.” But what becomes of those who know they are burning the hells of exploitation, racism, sexism, starvation, civil war, and the like while the esoteric dissident observes “critically” from offshore? What hope do they have of overthrowing these shackles of sovereignty? In not answering these questions, dissident IR ends up reproducing, despite avowals to the contrary, the sovereign outcome of discourse divorced from practice, analysis from policy, deconstruction from reconstruction, particulars from universals, and critical theory from problem-solving.

#### Reframing isn’t sufficient. Security framing is a pre-requisite for changing authority.

David **COLE** Law @ Georgetown **’12** “Confronting the Wizard of Oz: National Security, Expertise, and Secrecy” CONNECTICUT LAW REVIEW 44 (5) p. 1629-1633

Rana is right to focus our attention on the assumptions that frame modern Americans' conceptions about national security, but his assessment raises three initial questions. First, it seems far from clear that there ever was a "golden" era in which national security decisions were made by the common man, or "the people themselves," as Larry Kramer might put it.8 Rana argues that neither Hobbes nor Locke would support a worldview in which certain individuals are vested with superior access to the truth, and that faith in the superior abilities of so-called "experts" is a phenomenon of the New Deal era. 9 While an increased faith in scientific solutions to social problems may be a contributing factor in our current overreliance on experts,' 0 I doubt that national security matters were ever truly a matter of widespread democratic deliberation. Rana notes that in the early days of the republic, every able-bodied man had to serve in the militia, whereas today only a small (and largely disadvantaged) portion of society serves in the military." But serving in the militia and making decisions about national security are two different matters. The early days of the Republic were at least as dominated by "elites" as today. Rana points to no evidence that decisions about foreign affairs were any more democratic then than now. And, of course, the nation as a whole was far less democratic, as the majority of its inhabitants could not vote at all. 12 Rather than moving away from a golden age of democratic decision-making, it seems more likely that we have simply replaced one group of elites (the aristocracy) with another (the experts). Second, to the extent that there has been an epistemological shift with respect to national security, it seems likely that it is at least in some measure a response to objective conditions, not just an ideological development. If so, it's not clear that we can solve the problem merely by "thinking differently" about national security. The world has, in fact, become more interconnected and dangerous than it was when the Constitution was drafted. At our founding, the oceans were a significant buffer against attacks, weapons were primitive, and travel over long distances was extremely arduous and costly. The attacks of September 11, 2001, or anything like them, would have been inconceivable in the eighteenth or nineteenth centuries. Small groups of non-state actors can now inflict the kinds of attacks that once were the exclusive province of states. But because such actors do not have the governance responsibilities that states have, they are less susceptible to deterrence. The Internet makes information about dangerous weapons and civil vulnerabilities far more readily available, airplane travel dramatically increases the potential range of a hostile actor, and it is not impossible that terrorists could obtain and use nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons. 13 The knowledge necessary to monitor nuclear weapons, respond to cyber warfare, develop technological defenses to technological threats, and gather intelligence is increasingly specialized. The problem is not just how we think about security threats; it is also at least in part objectively based. Third, deference to expertise is not always an error; sometimes it is a rational response to complexity. Expertise is generally developed by devoting substantial time and attention to a particular set of problems. We cannot possibly be experts in everything that concerns us. So I defer to my son on the remote control, to my wife on directions (and so much else), to the plumber on my leaky faucet, to the electrician when the wiring starts to fail, to my doctor on my back problems, and to my mutual fund manager on investments. I could develop more expertise in some of these areas, but that would mean less time teaching, raising a family, writing, swimming, and listening to music. The same is true, in greater or lesser degrees, for all of us. And it is true at the level of the national community, not only for national security, but for all sorts of matters. We defer to the Environmental Protection Agency on environmental matters, to the Federal Reserve Board on monetary policy, to the Department of Agriculture on how best to support farming, and to the Federal Aviation Administration and the Transportation Security Administration on how best to make air travel safe. Specialization is not something unique to national security. It is a rational response to an increasingly complex world in which we cannot possibly spend the time necessary to gain mastery over all that affects our daily lives. If our increasing deference to experts on national security issues is in part the result of objective circumstances, in part a rational response to complexity, and not necessarily less "elitist" than earlier times, then it is not enough to "think differently" about the issue. We may indeed need to question the extent to which we rely on experts, but surely there is a role for expertise when it comes to assessing threats to critical infrastructure, devising ways to counter those threats, and deploying technology to secure us from technology's threats. As challenging as it may be to adjust our epistemological framework, it seems likely that even if we were able to sheer away all the unjustified deference to "expertise," we would still need to rely in substantial measure on experts. The issue, in other words, is not whether to rely on experts, but how to do so in a way that nonetheless retains some measure of self-government. The need for specialists need not preclude democratic decision-making. Consider, for example, the model of adjudication. Trials involving products liability, antitrust, patents, and a wide range of other issues typically rely heavily on experts.' 4 But critically, the decision is not left to the experts. The decision rests with the jury or judge, neither of whom purports to be an expert. Experts testify, but do so in a way that allows for adversarial testing and requires them to explain their conclusions to laypersons, who render judgment informed, but not determined, by the expert testimony. Similarly, Congress routinely acts on matters over which its members are not experts. Congress enacts laws governing a wide range of very complex issues, yet expertise is not a qualification for office. Members of Congress, like many political appointees in the executive branch, listen to and consider the views of experts to inform their decisions. Congress delegates initial consideration of most problems to committees, and by serving on those committees and devoting time and attention to the problems within their ambit, members develop a certain amount of expertise themselves. They may hire staff who have still greater expertise, and they hold hearings in which they invite testimony from still other experts. But at the end of the day, the decisions about what laws should be passed are made by the Congress as a whole, not by the experts. A similar process operates in the executive branch. The President and Vice-President generally need not be experts in any particular field, and many of the cabinet members they appoint are not necessarily experts either. They are managers and policy makers. They spend much of their day being briefed by people with more specialized expertise than they have. But at the end of the day, the important decisions are made by politically accountable actors. Thus, deference to experts need not preclude independent or democratically accountable decision-making. The larger problem may be one that Rana notes but does not sufficiently emphasize-an inordinate reliance on classified information and covert operations. 5 Secrecy is in many ways the ultimate enemy of democracy in the national security realm. 16 As Judge Damon Keith has written, "democracy dies behind closed doors.' ' 7 The experts in the intelligence community have the power to hide their decisions from external review and checks by classifying the information they consider or the actions they take.18 Even if they do so in good faith, the inevitable result is that their actions are increasingly insulated from scrutiny by others and immune from democratic checks. Virtually everyone who has had access to classified information concedes that the system leads to massive over-classification. 19 Our overreliance on secrecy may well be more central to the problem of inordinate deference than assumptions about the nature of knowledge regarding security. And in any event, the problems are mutually reinforcing. The inaccessibility of the information the experts rely upon compels us to defer to them because we lack sufficient grounds to question them. And that, in turn, may well make the experts more protective of their information and more likely to classify their actions, decisions, and considerations.

#### Lack of objectivity is irrelevant --- we can still make accurate claims about the world

Ferris 92 Timothy, Emeritus Prof @ Berkeley & Fellow at American Association for the Advancement of Science, The Mind's Sky: Human Intelligence in a Cosmic Context

This is not to say that every opinion about the universe deserves equal attention -- as if schoolteachers, in much the same way as they are being urged by fundamentalists to teach biblical creation myths alongside Darwinism, should also be enjoined to give equal weight to the flat-earth theory, ESP, or the notion that little Sally in the back row was empress dowager of China in a former life. That no one theory of the universe can deservedly gain permanent hegemony does not mean that all theories are equally valid. On the contrary: to understand the limitations of science (and art, and philosophy) can be a source of strength, emboldening us to renew our search for the objectively real even though we understand that the search will never end. I often reflect on a remark made to me one evening over dinner in a Padua restaurant by the English astrophysicist Dennis Sciama. . . . "The world is a fantasy," Sciama remarked, "so let's find out about it."

#### Preventing death is the first ethical priority – it’s the only impact you can’t recover from.

Bauman 95 Zygmunt Bauman, University of Leeds Professor Emeritus of Sociology, 1995, Life In Fragments: Essays In Postmodern Morality, p. 66-71

The being‑for is like living towards‑the‑future: a being filled with anticipation, a being aware of the abyss between future foretold and future that will eventually be; it is this gap which, like a magnet, draws the self towards the Other,as it draws life towards the future, making life into an activity of overcoming, transcending, leaving behind. The self stretches towards the Other, as life stretches towards the future; neither can grasp what it stretches toward, but it is in this hopeful and desperate, never conclusive and never abandoned stretching‑toward that the self is ever anew created and life ever anew lived. In the words of M. M. Bakhtin, it is only in this not‑yet accomplished world of anticipation and trial, leaning toward stubbornly an‑other Other, that life can be lived ‑ not in the world of the `events that occurred'; in the latter world, `it is impossible to live, to act responsibly; in it, I am not needed, in principle I am not there at all." Art, the Other, the future: what unites them, what makes them into three words vainly trying to grasp the same mystery, is the modality of possibility. A curious modality, at home neither in ontology nor epistemology; itself, like that which it tries to catch in its net, `always outside', forever `otherwise than being'. The possibility we are talking about here is not the all‑too‑familiar unsure‑of‑itself, and through that uncertainty flawed, inferior and incomplete being, disdainfully dismissed by triumphant existence as `mere possibility', `just a possibility'; possibility is instead `plus que la reahte' ‑ both the origin and the foundation of being. The hope, says Blanchot, proclaims the possibility of that which evades the possible; `in its limit, this is the hope of the bond recaptured where it is now lost."' The hope is always the hope of *being fu filled,* but what keeps the hope alive and so keeps the being open and on the move is precisely its *unfu filment.* One may say that the paradox *of hope* (and the paradox of possibility founded in hope) is that it may pursue its destination solely through betraying its nature; the most exuberant of energies expends itself in the urge towards rest. Possibility uses up its openness in search of closure. Its image of the better being is its own impoverishment . . . The togetherness of the being‑for is cut out of the same block; it shares in the paradoxical lot of all possibility. It lasts as long as it is unfulfilled, yet it uses itself up in never ending effort of fulfilment, of recapturing the bond, making it tight and immune to all future temptations. In an important, perhaps decisive sense, it is selfdestructive and self‑defeating: its triumph is its death. The Other, like restless and unpredictable art, like the future itself, is a *mystery.* And being‑for‑the‑Other, going towards the Other through the twisted and rocky gorge of affection, brings that mystery into view ‑ makes it into a challenge. That mystery is what has triggered the sentiment in the first place ‑ but cracking that mystery is what the resulting movement is about. The mystery must be unpacked so that the being‑for may focus on the Other: one needs to know what to focus on. (The `demand' is *unspoken,* the responsibility undertaken is *unconditional;* it is up to him or her who follows the demand and takes up the responsibility to decide what the following of that demand and carrying out of that responsibility means in practical terms.) Mystery ‑ noted Max Frisch ‑ (and the Other is a mystery), is an exciting puzzle, but one tends to get tired of that excitement. `And so one creates for oneself an image. This is a loveless act, the betrayal." Creating an image of the Other leads to the substitution of the image for the Other; the Other is now fixed ‑ soothingly and comfortingly. There is nothing to be excited about anymore. I know what the Other needs, I know where my responsibility starts and ends. Whatever the Other may now do will be taken down and used against him. What used to be received as an exciting surprise now looks more like perversion; what used to be adored as exhilarating creativity now feels like wicked levity. Thanatos has taken over from Eros, and the excitement of the ungraspable turned into the dullness and tedium of the grasped. But, as Gyorgy Lukacs observed, `everything one person may know about another is only expectation, only potentiality, only wish or fear, acquiring reality only as a result of what happens later, and this reality, too, dissolves straightaway into potentialities'. Only death, with its finality and irreversibility, puts an end to the musical‑chairs game of the real and the potential ‑ it once and for all closes the embrace of togetherness which was before invitingly open and tempted the lonely self." `Creating an image' is the dress rehearsal of that death. But creating an image is the inner urge, the constant temptation, the *must* of all affection . . . It is the loneliness of being abandoned to an unresolvable ambivalence and an unanchored and formless sentiment which sets in motion the togetherness of being‑for. But what loneliness seeks in togetherness is an end to its present condition ‑ an end to itself. Without knowing ‑ without being capable of knowing ‑ that the hope to replace the vexing loneliness with togetherness is founded solely on its own unfulfilment, and that once loneliness is no more, the togetherness ( the being‑for togetherness) must also collapse, as it cannot survive its own completion. What the loneliness seeks in togetherness (suicidally for its own cravings) is the foreclosing and pre‑empting of the future, cancelling the future before it comes, robbing it of mystery but also of the possibility with which it is pregnant. Unknowingly yet necessarily, it seeks it all to its own detriment, since the success (if there is a success) may only bring it back to where it started and to the condition which prompted it to start on the journey in the first place. The togetherness of being‑for is always in the future, and nowhere else. It is no more once the self proclaims: `I have arrived', `I have done it', `I fulfilled my duty.' The being‑for starts from the realization of the bottomlessness of the task, and ends with the declaration that the infinity has been exhausted. This is the tragedy of being‑for ‑ the reason why it cannot but be death‑bound while simultaneously remaining an undying attraction. In this tragedy, there are many happy moments, but no happy end. Death is always the foreclosure of possibilities, and it comes eventually in its own time, even if not brought forward by the impatience of love. The catch is to direct the affection to staving off the end, and to do this against the affection's nature. What follows is that, if moral relationship is grounded in the being-for togetherness (as it is), then it can exist as a project, and guide the self's conduct only as long as its nature of a project (a not yet-completed project) is not denied. Morality, like the future itself, is forever not‑yet. (And this is why the ethical code, any ethical code, the more so the more perfect it is by its own standards, supports morality the way the rope supports the hanged man.) It is because of our loneliness that we crave togetherness. It is because of our loneliness that we open up to the Other and allow the Other to open up to us. It is because of our loneliness (which is only belied, not overcome, by the hubbub of the being‑with) that we turn into moral selves. And it is only through allowing the togetherness its possibilities which only the future can disclose that we stand a chance of acting morally, and sometimes even of being good, in the present.

#### Call for end of security frame sparks American natioanalist backlash and international chaos – we should channel American identity productively.

Michael **HUNT** History @ UNC (Chapel Hill) **‘9** *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy* p. 214-218

The third and last facet of the momentous U.S . encounter with the world was the establishment of pervasive economic and cultural influence-what might be described as hegemony. Woodrow Wilson gave voice to hege- monic aspirations that had in view (prematurely, to be sure) nothing less than the remaking of the world. Already in the 1920s American values and institutions were having a widening impact, and they grew even greater after World War II. Washington's success at establishing an international leadership historically unprecedented in its breadth had important ideological consequences. Above all, it confirmed long-standing assumptions about an exceptional U.S. role in the world: people everywhere must deep down admire Americans, would gladly (if possible) become American, and surely looked to Washington as a repository of wisdom to which all countries should defer. Less noticed was how this special postwar standing created problems at home and set limits on U.S. action abroad. Dominance spawned resentments that on occasion inspired direct resistance and made hegemony more difficult to exercise. Faced with surly foreigners, perplexed officials tried to speak more clearly or more loudly. But the angry voices persisted, while a consumer-minded electorate wondered why bother with a benighted and ungrateful world. More serious still, these claims to international leadership imposed constraints on U.S. policymakers and their public. Americans had to actually know something about the world they claimed to lead. This was an inherently difficult task given the breadth of the U.S. reach. Making it even more trying was the notoriously insular nature of U.S. society, with its strongly nationalist bent shaped by animosity to one external threat after another. Compounding the problem, the public put an ever-higher value on individualism and consumerism. Citizens devoted to their distinctly materialist and individualist sense of the good life wanted ever-rising abundance and proved allergic, even phobic, when faced with military service or higher taxes. Further complicating the exercise of hegemony, policymakers limited their own freedom of action by paying obeisance to the invisible hand of the marketplace and embracing the utopian notion of a world turned over to international market forces in which corporations rather than states represented the highest form of human organization and activity. Policymakers operating on the global stage found themselves bound in yet another way-by the need to pay attention to the opinion of other international leaders as the price for securing deference and maintaining legitimacy. These crosscurrents engulfing U.S. policymakers over the twentieth century are an important part of any effort to understand the career of my core policy ideas. These several neglected dimensions to my argument have major implications for the controversial call in the concluding chapter of Ideology for a more modest (some might say "isolationist") foreign policy. I now have to concede that I was on the wrong trail. The United States is now implicated in world affairs in such a deep and complex fashion that a retreat is hard to imagine and if attempted might produce dire consequences overseas, notably a breakdown of global integration, with international anarchy a likely prospect. Moreover, an assertive U.S. nationalism is so important in providing social glue for a diverse, mobile people that a repudiation of the country's leading role on the international stage might well prove deeply divisive at home and spawn bitter cries of betrayal. Finally, pressing domestic problems are now inextricably entangled with international trends and pressures, ranging from climate change to global finance and trade to resource scarcity to immigrant pressures generated by failed states and stagnant economies. Rather than calling for a more modest foreign policy, I would now praise mid-twentieth-century U.S.leaders for following a visionary policy that included the Bretton Woods reforms for the international economy, the creation of the United Nations and other international organizations, the assertion of basic human rights, the decision to hold state leaders responsible for their crimes, and the priority given to economic recovery and relief. These measures were all conducive to world order and prosperity. U.S. leaders in recent decades deserve censure precisely because they neglected or even repudiated the public goods that the United States as hegemon is obligated to provide. A policy at once more territorially interventionist (imperial) and hands-off (neoliberal) in matters of global governance endangers the system of values and institutions promoted in the wake of World War II. The problem I am left with today is not much different from the one that haunted me in the conclusion of Ideology twenty years ago. How does one create an ideological foundation for a different kind of policy-one that serves the American people well while also advancing the cause of human welfare? Reflecting on this question has provided a chastening but useful reminder that ideologies are a lot easier to identify and explore than to construct or transform.

#### Epistemology 1st wrong – Act in face of uncertainty or forever study things that can never get fully flushed-out.

Cochran ‘99

Molly Cochran Assistant Professor of International Affairs @ Georgia Institute for Technology, Normative Theory in International Relations. 1999, Page 272

To conclude this chapter, while modernist and postmodernist debates continue, while we are still unsure as to what we can legitimately identify as a feminist ethical/political concern, while we still are unclear about the relationship between discourse and experience, it is particularly important for feminists that we proceed with analysis of both the material (institutional and structural) as well as the discursive. This holds not only for feminists, but for all theorists oriented towards the goal of extending further moral inclusion in the present social sciences climate of epistemological uncertainty. Important ethical/political concerns hang in the balance. We cannot afford to wait for the meta-theoretical questions to be conclusively answered. Those answers may be unavailable. Nor can we wait for a credible vision of an alternative institutional order to appear before an emancipatory agenda can be kicked into gear. Nor do we have before us a chicken and egg question of which comes first: sorting out the metatheoretical issues or working out which practices contribute to a credible institutional vision. The two questions can and should be pursued together, and can be via moral imagination. Imagination can help us think beyond discursive and material conditions which limit us, by pushing the boundaries of those limitations in thought and examining what yields. In this respect, I believe international ethics as pragmatic critique can be a useful ally to feminist and normative theorists generally.

#### No root cause of war so changing existing norms alone fails– counter-cultural pressures require political agency that respects the power of dominant systems.

Jack **SNYDER** IR @ Columbia **’12** in *Power and Progress* p. 88-92

The end of the Cold War has given rise to hopes among many international relations scholars and public activists that a dramatic transformation in world politics is now unfolding. They contend that changes in norms, ideas, and culture have the power to tame the historically war-prone nature of international anarchy. ' This analysis and the prescriptions that follow from it exaggerate the autonomy of ideas and culture in shaping behavior in anarchy. A rich body of research on war by anthropologists suggests that ideas and culture are best understood not as autonomous but as embedded in complex social systems shaped by the interaction of material circumstances, institutional arrangements, and strategic choices, as well as by ideas and culture. Cultural prescriptions that ignore these multifaceted interactions will provide a poor road map to guide strategies of global change. Those who foresee substantial opportunities to transform the war-prone international system into a realm governed by benign norms contend that "anarchy is what states make of it."2 In their view, culture, defined as shared knowledge or symbols that create meaning within a social group, determines whether behavior in the absence of a common governing authority is bloody or benign. If more benign ideas and identities are effectively spread across the globe through cultural change and normative persuasion, then "ought" can be transformed into "is". Support for warlike dictators can be undermined, perpetrators of war crimes and atrocities can be held accountable, benign multicultural identities can be fostered, and international and civil wars w ill wane3 These academic concepts have a potent counterpart in the international human rights approach of activist organizations 4 In contrast, skeptics about such transformations argue that anarchy, whether among states coexisting in a self- help system or among contending groups inside collapsed states , gives rise to an inescapable logic of insecurity and competition that culture cannot trump5 These skeptics fear that a transformative attempt to supersede self-help behavior amounts to reckless overreaching that will create backlashes and quagmires. Ironically, in this view, the idealist vanguard of the new world order will need to rely increasingly on old-fashioned military and economic coercion in a futile effort to change world culture for the better.6 This is a debate of compelling intellectual and practical import. It lays bare the most fundamental assumptions about the nature of world politics that underpin real policy choices about the deployment of the vast military, economic, and moral resources of the United States and other wealthy democraci es. However, some of the leading voices in this debate, both in academic and broader public settings, overlook the decisive interplay between situational constraints and the creation of culture. Prophets of transformation sometimes assert that politics in anarchy and society is driven by " ideas almost all the way down." They dismiss as negligible what Alexander Wendt ca lls "rump" material constraints rooted in biology, the physical environment, or other circumstances unalterable through changes in symbolism.7 For them, "agency" by political actors committed to social change consists primarily in working to alter prevailing principled ideas, such as promoting the norm of universal jurisdiction in the case of crimes against humanity. In contrast, working for improved outcomes within existing constraints of material power, for example, by bargaining with still powerful human rights abusers, does not count for them as true "agency"; rather it is mere myopic "problem solving" within constraints8 Conversely, when prophets of continuity discuss culture at all, they treat it as a largely unchangeable force that may have some effect in constituting the units competing for security but that has at most a secondary effect on strategic interactions between those units, which are driven mainly by the logic of the anarchical situation9 This is an unnecessarily truncated menu of possibilities for imagining the relationship between anarchy and culture. Ironically, in light of the ambitiously activist agenda of the proponents of cultural approaches to international relations, their one-dimensional approach limits agents to a peculiarly circumscribed set of tools for promoting political change. A more promising approach would integrate the material, institutional, and cultural aspects of social change, drawing on the insights of theories of complex systems. Robert Jervis reminds us that the elements of complex systems, such as international anarchy, are highly interconnected and consequently the behavior of the system as a whole cannot be understood just by examining its separate parts.10 In a tightly coupled system, a change in one of its aspects, such as norms or ideas, is unlikely to have simple, linear effects . T he consequences of any change can be predicted only by considering its interaction with other attributes of the system. For example, whether the spread of the concept of national self-determination promotes peace or war may depend on the material and institutional setting in which it occurs. Negative feedback may cancel out a change that is at odds with the self-correcting logic of the system as a whole. Conversely, in unstable systems, positive feedback may amplify the effects of small changes. More complicated feedback effects may also be possible, depending on the nature of the system. Actions in a system may have different consequences when carried out in different sequences. In social systems, outcomes of an actor's plans depend on strategic interactions with the choices of other independent decision nl.akers. For example, projects for cultural change are likely to provoke cultural counterprojects from those threatened by them. Even in "games against nature," changes in behavior may transform the material setting in ways that foil actors' expectation s. For all these reasons, system effects are likely to skew or derail transformative efforts that focus narrowly on changing a single aspect of social life, such as norms and ideas. All of these system effects are relevant to understanding the effect of culture on conflict in anarchy. As I describe later, anthropological research on war shows that ideas, norms, and culture are typically interconnected with the material and institutional elements of anarchical social systems in ways that produce the full panoply of Jervis's system effects. In such systems, efforts to promote cultural transformation need to take into account the material and situational preconditions that sustain these developments; otherwise they are likely to produce unintended consequences. Underestimating situational constraints is just as dangerous and unwarranted as reifying them. Testing the effects of culture: insights from the anthropology of war Current debates about anarchy and culture have been carried out largely at the level of abstract philosophy and visceral morality. Ultimately, however, the impact of culture on war in anarchy is an empirical question. What evidence should be examined? To assess the claim that behavior in an anarchical system is what the units and their culture make of it, the obvious methodological move is to vary the culture of the units or of the system as a whole and then assess the effect on behavior. Reasonably enough, some scholars who see anarchical behavior as culturally constructed examine contemporary changes, such as the peaceful end of the Cold War, the emergence of the democratic peace, and the purported current strengthening of human rights norms. 11 In assessing such developments , it is difficult to distinguish the hopes of transitional moments from enduring trends . These kinds of tests, while not irrelevant , are not well designed to disentangle the effects of autonomous changes in ideas and culture from the effects of selfjustifying US hegemonic power, an ideological pattern that was quite familiar in the old world order. Other scholars try to show that the progenitor of the contemporary international system-the historical European balance-of-power system among sovereign states-was itself a by-product of ideas, such as the Protestant Reformation or analogies between sovereignty and individual property rights.12 The implication is that whatever has been established by ideas can also be dismantled by ideas. However, it is not a simple task to disentangle the effects of war, state formation, and ideological change on the emergence of the competitive states system. 13 Arguably, a comparison of the European system with behavior in other anarchical state systems offers a methodologically cleaner way to vary culture and assess its effects. However, when cultural constructivists do look at behavior in anarchies in cultural settings radically different from our own, they sometimes fail to exploit obvious opportunities for focused comparison. For example, Ian Johnston's prominent book Cultural Realism shows how the strategic wisdoms of the anarchical ancient Chinese Warring States system were passed down to future generations to constitute a warlike strategic "culture." His adherence to a cultural account of Chinese strategic practices remains untroubled by the fact that these ideas and practices are similar to those of the anarchic European balance- ofpower system, the ancient Greek city-states, and the ancient Indian states system described by Kautilya, a set of cultures diverse in almost every way except their strategic behavior. 14 At a first approximation, it would seem from this evidence that state behavior in anarchy is not fundamentally altered by variations in culture. This is not to deny that cultural differences may have influenced the meaning the actors imputed to their military behavior, some of the goals for which they fought, and some political features of these anarchical systems. Nonetheless, the evidence from historical state systems strongly suggests that the situational incentives of anarchy have significantly shaped strategic behavior in ways that transcend culture. Constructivists have paid less attention to another body of evidence ideally suited to assessing the effects of variations in culture on behavior in anarchy. For decades, anthropologists have been amassing a theoretically rich, empirically substantial, and methodologically self-aware body of statistical and case- study research on the relationship between war and culture in stateless societies and preindustrial anarchic systems. 15 Many of the causal factors and processes they examine will seem strikingly familiar to students of modern international relations-for example, security fears, economic rivalry between groups, economic interdependence, the institutionalization of cooperative ties across political units, the popular accountability of decision makers, and the nature of identities and cultural symbolism of the political units and of the anarchic system as a whole. Notwithstanding the familiarity of these categories, the kinds of societies anthropologists of war study differ vastly from contemporary, industrialized, bureaucratized societies, and thus research findings on the anthropological history of war can not simply be read off and applied to debates about the construction of culture in today's "new world order." Indeed, a central part of the constructivist claim is that the spread of a new democratic culture may be on the verge of making obsolete all those old cultural patterns, whether those of the Cold War, the ancient Chinese Warring States, or warring villages in the Venezuelan jungle. 16 Moreover, evidence based on technologically primitive societies, some of which lack the minimal economic resources needed for assured survival, may load the dice in favor of explanations based on material pressures. However, following the arguments ofDurkheim or Weber, one could also argue that this type of evidence is biased in favor of cultural explanations on the grounds that social solidarity in such societies is achieved more through cultural rituals than through differentiated, rational- legal institutions

#### Reps =/= wars

Rodwell 5—PhD candidate, Manchester Met. (Jonathan, Trendy But Empty: A Response to Richard Jackson, http://www.49thparallel.bham.ac.uk/back/issue15/rodwell1.htm, AMiles)

In this response I wish to argue that the Post-Structural analysis put forward by Richard Jackson is inadequate when trying to understand American Politics and Foreign Policy. The key point is that this is an issue of methodology and theory. I do not wish to argue that language is not important, in the current political scene (or indeed any political era) that would be unrealistic. One cannot help but be convinced that the creation of identity, of defining ones self (or one nation, or societies self) in opposition to an ‘other’ does indeed take place. Masses of written and aural evidence collated by Jackson clearly demonstrates that there is a discursive pattern surrounding post 9/11 U.S. politics and society. [i] Moreover as expressed at the start of this paper it is a political pattern and logic that this language is useful for politicians, especially when able to marginalise other perspectives. Nothing illustrates this clearer than the fact George W. Bush won re-election, for whatever the reasons he did win, it is undeniable that at the very least the war in Iraq, though arguable far from a success, at the absolute minimum did not damage his campaign. Additionally it is surely not stretching credibility to argue Bush performance and rhetoric during the immediate aftermath of the 9/11 attacks also strengthened his position. However, having said that, the problem is Jackson’s own theoretical underpinning, his own justification for the importance of language. If he was merely proposing that the understanding of language as one of many causal factors is important that would be fine. But he is not. The epistemological and theoretical framework of his argument means the ONLY thing we should look at is language and this is the problem.[ii] Rather than being a fairly simple, but nonetheless valid, argument, because of the theoretical justification it actually becomes an almost nonsensical. My response is roughly laid out in four parts. Firstly I will argue that such methodology, in isolation, is fundamentally reductionist with a theoretical underpinning that does not conceal this simplicity. Secondly, that a strict use of post-structural discourse analysis results in an epistemological cul-de-sac in which the writer cannot actually say anything. Moreover the reader has no reason to accept anything that has been written. The result is at best an explanation that remains as equally valid as any other possible interpretation and at worse a work that retains no critical force whatsoever. Thirdly, possible arguments in response to this charge; that such approaches provide a more acceptable explanation than others are, in effect, both a tacit acceptance of the poverty of force within the approach and of the complete lack of understanding of the identifiable effects of the real world around us; thus highlighting the contradictions within post-structural claims to be moving beyond traditional causality, re-affirming that rather than pursuing a post-structural approach we should continue to employ the traditional methodologies within History, Politics and International Relations. Finally as a consequence of these limitations I will argue that the post-structural call for ‘intertextuals’ must be practiced rather than merely preached and that an understanding and utilisation of all possible theoretical approaches must be maintained if academic writing is to remain useful rather than self-contained and narrative. Ultimately I conclude that whilst undeniably of some value post-structural approaches are at best a footnote in our understanding . The first major problem then is that historiographically discourse analysis is so capacious as to be largely of little use. The process of inscription identity, of discourse development is not given any political or historical context, it is argued that it just works, is simply a universal phenomenon. It is history that explains everything and therefore actually explains nothing. To be specific if the U.S. and every other nation is continually reproducing identities through ‘othering’ it is a constant and universal phenomenon that fails to help us understand at all why one result of the othering turned out one way and differently at another time. For example, how could one explain how the process resulted in the 2003 invasion of Iraq but didn’t produce a similar invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 when that country (and by the logic of the Regan administrations discourse) the West was threatened by the ‘Evil Empire’. By the logical of discourse analysis in both cases these policies were the result of politicians being able to discipline and control the political agenda to produce the outcomes. So why were the outcomes not the same? To reiterate the point how do we explain that the language of the War on Terror actually managed to result in the eventual Afghan invasion in 2002? Surely it is impossible to explain how George W. Bush was able to convince his people (and incidentally the U.N and Nato) to support a war in Afghanistan without referring to a simple fact outside of the discourse; the fact that a known terrorist in Afghanistan actually admitted to the murder of thousands of people on the 11h of Sepetember 2001. The point is that if the discursive ‘othering’ of an ‘alien’ people or group is what really gave the U.S. the opportunity to persue the war in Afghanistan one must surly wonder why Afghanistan. Why not North Korea? Or Scotland? If the discourse is so powerfully useful in it’s own right why could it not have happened anywhere at any time and more often? Why could the British government not have been able to justify an armed invasion and regime change in Northern Ireland throughout the terrorist violence of the 1980’s? Surely they could have just employed the same discursive trickery as George W. Bush? Jackson is absolutely right when he points out that the actuall threat posed by Afghanistan or Iraq today may have been thoroughly misguided and conflated and that there must be more to explain why those wars were enacted at that time. Unfortunately that explanation cannot simply come from the result of inscripting identity and discourse. On top of this there is the clear problem that the consequences of the discursive othering are not necessarily what Jackson would seem to identify. This is a problem consistent through David Campbell’s original work on which Jackson’s approach is based[iii]. David Campbell argued for a linguistic process that ‘always results in an other being marginalized’ or has the potential for ‘demonisation’[iv]. At the same time Jackson, building upon this, maintains without qualification that the systematic and institutionalised abuse of Iraqi prisoners first exposed in April 2004 “is a direct consequence of the language used by senior administration officials: conceiving of terrorist suspects as ‘evil’, ‘inhuman’ and ‘faceless enemies of freedom creates an atmosphere where abuses become normalised and tolerated”[v]. The only problem is that the process of differentiation does not actually necessarily produce dislike or antagonism. In the 1940’s and 50’s even subjected to the language of the ‘Red Scare’ it’s obvious not all Americans came to see the Soviets as an ‘other’ of their nightmares. And in Iraq the abuses of Iraqi prisoners are isolated cases, it is not the case that the U.S. militarily summarily abuses prisoners as a result of language. Surely the massive protest against the war, even in the U.S. itself, is also a self evident example that the language of ‘evil’ and ‘inhumanity’ does not necessarily produce an outcome that marginalises or demonises an ‘other’. Indeed one of the points of discourse is that we are continually differentiating ourselves from all others around us without this necessarily leading us to hate fear or abuse anyone.[vi] Consequently, the clear fear of the Soviet Union during the height of the Cold War, and the abuses at Abu Ghirab are unusual cases. To understand what is going on we must ask how far can the process of inscripting identity really go towards explaining them? As a result at best all discourse analysis provides us with is a set of universals and a heuristic model.

### CP

#### Flex

Dycus 10 (Professor Vermont Law School, “Congress’s Role in Cyber Warfare”, 8/11/2010, <http://jnslp.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/08/11_Dycus.pdf>)

Because of the grave potential consequences and the attendant need for close control and accountability, such operations should be undertaken only by government officials. These recommendations are, of course, riddled with terms that require careful definition. They also omit many critical details. Specific provisions relating to timing of notices and the requirement of consultation, for example, must be worked out between the political branches. Congress’s active role in the development and implementation of cyber warfare policy is no guarantee of national security. The policy might be flawed in various ways. There is also a risk that whatever policy is adopted will not be properly executed or that its execution will have unintended results. The policy might be misunderstood or might not provide clear or appropriate guidance in the urgent circumstances facing its interpreter. The person charged with implementing the policy might make a mistake – for example, by interpreting a potential enemy’s electronic espionage as an attack. Available cyber weaponry might not work as planned. Or a purely defensive move by U.S. operators might be construed by another nation as offensive, and provoke an attack. Nor can the clearest policy, statutory or executive, guarantee compliance by an Executive determined to ignore it.71 The rules might be construed by the President in a way that reduces the importance of Congress’s role. Or they might be challenged in court. Congress should not, however, hesitate to take the steps outlined here merely because they might produce unintended results or because they could be difficult to enforce. Exactly the same criticisms could be leveled at almost any reorganization or legislative initiative. The high stakes in this instance, and Congress’s constitutional responsibility for formulation of national security policy, mean that Congress cannot sit this one out. It might be suggested that these proposed measures would dangerously tie the President’s hands, thereby limiting her freedom to respond to unpredictable future national security threats. The very point of the recommendations, however, is that Congress should place limits on the President’s actions – to require her to share the responsibility for deciding to go to war. Even then, if the nation comes under sudden cyber or kinetic attack the President will remain free to respond as she sees fit. The United States faces unprecedented challenges from enemies equipped with new weaponry possessing vast, evolving destructive potential. The two political branches must draw on their respective expertise and experiences to work together to meet these challenges, as the Framers intended.

#### Plan solves

Peter J. Partell, September 1997. Binghamton University. “Executive Constraints and Success in International Crises,” Political Research Quarterly, 50.3.

What determines the outcome of an international dispute? Traditionally, a state's success has been thought to be a function of its military capability and its demonstrated resolve. These two attributes of crisis "structure," the bal- ance of capability and the balance of motivation, are at the heart of a number of models of international crises (e.g., Morgan 1994; Morrow 1989; Snyder and Diesing 1977). As Snyder and Diesing (1977: 525) state, "Comparative interests and comparative military strength, as the parties perceive them, are the basic determinants of relative bargaining power and crisis outcomes." This emphasis on capability and resolve in interstate crises is often associated with political realism, which views international relations as state-centric, a con- stant struggle for power, and governed exclusively by national interests. Yet, a number of recent studies have highlighted the importance of domestic influ- ences on a variety of foreign policy decisions (Gaubatz 1996; Morgan and Palmer 1997; Russett 1993; Siverson and Emmons 1991; Doyle 1986; Ostrom and Job 1986). Do these studies call the traditional realist perspective on cri- sis bargaining, with its emphasis on capability and resolve, into question? A growing body of international relations literature suggests that certain types of domestic political structures, particularly those that constrain a leader's ability to unilaterally make policy decisions, can act to enhance the credibility of a state's commitment (Gaubatz 1996; Fearon 1994b; Putnam 1988; Schelling 1960). The implication of this view is that domestic political structures can have a strong influence on international crisis outcomes by increasing the ability of states to demonstrate their resolve. In light of these arguments, the realist emphasis on capability and resolve is not misguided, but is somewhat narrow in focus. Traditionally, it has been thought that demonstrating resolve is accomplished by using high levels of military force, but the executive-con- straints literature suggests that domestic political circumstances can also in- crease a state's ability to demonstrate resolve. If this is the case, realists have overlooked the role that domestic politics plays in increasing a state's ability to bargain successfully.

#### Deterrence is impossible in cyber space – Attriibution, Identity, Proxies, Escalation incentive

Owens et al. 09 (WILLIAM A. OWENS, AEA Holdings, Inc., Co-chair KENNETH W. DAM, University of Chicago, Co-chair THOMAS A. BERSON, Anagram Laboratories GERHARD CASPER, Stanford University DAVID D. CLARK, Massachusetts Institute of Technology RICHARD L. GARWIN, IBM Fellow Emeritus JACK L. GOLDSMITH III, Harvard Law School CARL G. O’BERRY, The Boeing Company JEROME H. SALTZER, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (retired) MARK SEIDEN, MSB Associates SARAH SEWALL, Harvard University WALTER B. SLOCOMBE, Caplin & Drysdale WILLIAM O. STUDEMAN, U.S. Navy (retired) MICHAEL A. VATIS, Steptoe & Johnson LLP, “Technology, Policy, Law, and Ethics Regarding U.S. Acquisition and Use of Cyberattack Capabilities”, pdf)

It remains an open question as to whether the concepts of deterrence are relevant when applied to the domain of cyberconflict per se (that is, cyberconflict without reference to conflict in physical domains). For example, a credible threat to impose costs requires knowledge of the party on which the costs should be imposed—and as discussed in Chapter 2, attribution of a cyberattack is a very difficult and time-consuming—and perhaps insoluble—problem.

Moreover, even if the adversary is known, and known to be a specific nation-state, the costs to be imposed must be judged by the adversary as greater than the gain that might result from his aggressive actions. Thus, the United States must be able to identify cyber targets in or of the adversary nation whose loss would be costly to the adversary, and it must be able to attack them with high confidence of success.

In a nation that is not highly dependent on information technology, such assets would be hard to find. Even if the nation did have valuable information technology assets, specific individual targets (perhaps numbering in the dozens or hundreds—a wild guess!) most valuable to the adversary are likely to be very well protected against cyberattack. The civilian IT infrastructure at large may be less well protected, but largescale attacks on such infrastructure raise ethical and moral questions about targeting civilians. The military IT infrastructure could be targeted as well, but the degree to which it is well protected may be unknown to the attacker (see discussion in Chapter 2 regarding intelligence requirements for successful focused cyberattacks).

In addition, an attacker that launches a cyberattack should also be expected to take action to change its own defensive posture just prior to doing so. As discussed in Chapter 2, much can be done to invalidate an adversary’s intelligence preparations, which are necessary for discriminating counterattacks. And since the attacker knows when he will launch the attack, he can create a window during which his defensive posture will be stronger. The window would last only as long as it would take for new intelligence efforts to collect the necessary information, but it would likely be long enough to forestall immediate retaliation.

A threat to deny benefits to a cyberattacker also lacks credibility in certain important ways. In principle, defensive technologies to harden targets against cyberattacks can be deployed, raising the difficulty of attacking them. But decades of experience suggest that deploying these technologies and making effective use of them on a society-wide basis to improve the overall cybersecurity posture of a nation is difficult indeed. And there is virtually no prospect of being able to reduce a cyberattacker’s capabilities through offensive action, because of the ease with which cyberattack weapons can be acquired. Thus, counterforce capabilities—which in the nuclear domain have been justified in large part as necessary to reduce the threat posed by an adversary’s nuclear weapons—do not exist in any meaningful way in contemplating cyberconflict.

How do the considerations above change if, as in the real world, the states involved also have kinetic capabilities, which may include nuclear weapons, and physical vulnerabilities? That is, each side could, in principle, use kinetic weapons to attack physical targets, and these targets might be military or dual purpose in nature as long as they are legitimate targetsunder LOAC. Because a transition from cyber-only conflict to kinetic conflict would likely constitute an escalation (and would in any case make the conflict more overt), this point is discussed in more detail below.

#### We can’t deter in cyber space – OCEOs are irrational – non state actors makes that impossible

Gompert & Saunders 11 (David C. Gompert, bachelor's degree in engineering from the U.S. Naval Academy, where he once served on the faculty, and a master of public affairs degree from Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. Office of the Director of National Intelligence, Gompert most recently worked as a senior fellow at the RAND Corp, and Phillip C. Saunders, phD in IR from Princeton, Distinguished Research Fellow Director of Studies, Center for Strategic Research Director, Center for Study of Chinese Military Affairs, “The Paradox of Power Sino-American Strategic Restraint in an Age of Vulnerability”, <http://www.ndu.edu/inss/docuploaded/Paradox%20of%20Power.pdf>)

It is also important to recognize at the outset that cyberspace, unlike nuclear and space domains, is largely the realm of nonstate entities, including unfriendly ones that would attack Chinese or American strategic networks if they could. This makes determining the origin of a cyber attack and the identity of the attacker that much more difficult. Moreover, the network paths that attacks take often transit intermediate countries, especially if the attacker wishes to cover its tracks. These nonstate and transnational aspects of cyberspace make it harder to take to task countries from or through which nonstate cyber attackers may operate, compounding the difficulty of establishing deterrence and thus mutual restraint across a large family of cyber threats. Indeed, blaming attacks on rogue hackers operating from their territory is a predictable deflection for state attackers.

## 1AR

### 1AR – Defense

#### Chinese democracy structurally shifts that solve Asia war – try or die for the aff

Waldron 4—Arthur Waldron, Senior Fellow of Foreign Policy Research Institute and the Lauder Professor of International Relations at the University of Pennsylvania [Spring 2004, “Democratization and Greater China: How Would Democracy Change China?” Orbis, www.fpri.org/orbis/4802/waldron.democracychangechina.pdf]

How would a democratic Chinese parliament assess Chinese national interests? First, it would be interested in improving the living standards of the country’s hundreds of millions of impoverished people. The only way to free resources for this would be to change the foreign policy that demands, for example, such vast military expenditures. This would entail shifting friend- ships away from the few countries that seek to counter U.S. dominance in the world and reorienting toward the countries that provide the most to China economically. In other words, Beijing would have to become friendly with the United States, its biggest market; Japan, another major trading partner and, to a lesser extent, investor; South Korea and Taiwan, both important trading partners and major investors (China’s info-tech industry is owned roughly 70 percent by Taiwan and 15 percent by South Korea); Europe (a major market and investor); and Australia (a major trading partner, particularly in raw materials). And being rid of its empire, it could enter into genuine friendship, or at least correct relations, with peoples who had previously despised it for its colonial rule. Hitherto, Beijing has placed disproportionate stress on supporting other dictatorships. It is deeply involved in Myanmar (whose human rights record, it must be admitted, is somewhat better than China’s). It continues to subsidize North Korea, providing Pyongyang with items of trade that can be used for military programs. It has supported Pakistan’s nuclear program. Its support for Serbia as NATO attempted to dislodge Slobodan Milosevic in 1999 was massive. Beijing continues to undermine its relationship with Washington through its rigid 14 approach to Taiwan, which should be its partner, and its interest in Cuba, in particular in the former Soviet signals intelligence facilities there. China has been reported, at least in the past, to be involved in supporting a range of unsavory regimes in the Middle East and to maintain a close clandestine military relationship with Israel. This political and military club is not one to which China should want to belong. Under conditions of freedom and democracy, China would move to non-belligerence toward the West, cooperation, and increasing openness. This would of course greatly beneﬁt China’s neighbors and the United States, ending the accelerating arms race that wastes so much money and creates so much danger in Asia today. But for now China remains a dictatorship, and as such it cannot welcome the prospect of other dictatorships’ becoming free. China is an odd ﬁt: its culture, from the time of Confucius, has contained plenty of liberal elements, and in the past century, democracy was the shared demand of most of the intelligentsia, some of whom imagined that communism would be democratic.15 Not only that, until 1949 China was, politically, far freer than it is today. True, it was ruled autocratically, but ideas could be published and discussed, universities harbored genuinely free thought, and entrepreneurship was relatively untrammeled. So China’s current global policies, far from being a natural consequence of Chinese tradition and national interest, are anomalous.

#### Relations are compartmentalized and resilient

Zagoria 1/17/13 (Senior Vice President National Committee on American Foreign Policy, Professor Zagoria earned his B.A. at Rutgers University and his M.A. and Ph.D. at Columbia University., “U.S.-China Strategic Dialogue”, <http://ncafp.org/cms/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/US-China-Strategic-Dialogue-Report_Jan-2013.pdf>)

U.S.-PRC tensions have been aggravated by mutual suspicions and a lack of trust. They should be addressed on two levels. First, both sides agreed that there should be an early but well-prepared summit between the two leaders. But there also needs to be greater cooperation on a series of global, regional and bilateral issues and both the United States and the PRC should actively seek out specific areas where they can establish a track record of cooperation.

One piece of good news is that the bilateral military relationship has picked up some momentum in the past year and is becoming more productive even though it remains fragile

Also, the U.S.-China relationship needs to be looked at in historical perspective. On balance, despite ups and downs, U.S.-China relations have been extremely resilient and often positive. Bilateral ties have expanded across the tenures of seven U.S. presidents and three PRC leaders since Nixon’s opening to Mao in the early 1970s. These relations have survived several crises and disputes during this period, including Tiananmen, the Taiwan Straits crisis of 1996, Taiwan President Chen Shui-bian’s moves towards independence, differences over North Korea, Iran, human rights, Chinese dissidents and currency issues.

**Regime collapse won’t cause catastrophe --- impact claims are just fearmongering to support propaganda**

Bruce **Gilley, 200**PhD Candidate Politics @ Princeton U. and Adjunct Prof. Int’l. Affairs @ New School U. “China's Democratic Future: How it Will Happen and where it Will Lead,” p. 115-116, Google Print.

Would the entire PRC edifice simply collapse from the accumulated pressures of crisis and mass protest? In cross-country comparisons, "post-totalitarian" states like China are the most vulnerable to collapse because they are unable to respond creatively to protest and yet there is no organized opposition to assume control. The East German regime was a perfect example. It simply collapsed when huge defections from the state occurred at every level and there was no organized opposition ready to take over. In the German case, there was a neighboring fraternal state whose arms provided some cushion for the collapse. China would not have the same support. For this reason, the CCP and many of its supporters have warned of the dangers of collapse in words designed to scare the regime's opponents into quiescence. Fear-mongering about the consequences of regime collapse in China has been a staple of PRC propaganda since reforms began. Deng said: "If the political situation in china became unstable the trouble would spread to the rest of the world, with consequences that would be hard to imagine." Foreign scholars have taken up the histrionics with relish. One has worried about "societal disintegration" and even "the fragmentation of China into several competing polities." Another warns: "At worst the resulting chaos from a collapsing China would have a profound effect on the stability of Asia and on the U.S. policy to guarantee the security of its Asian allies. At the least, China could turn to the West for economic relief and reconstruction, the price tag of which would be overwhelming." Yet these fears appear overblown or misplaced. First, as we saw in the last part, many of these dire predictions are an accurate portrayal of China today. The problems of Party rule have created the very crisis that the fear-mongers alluded to. China already has an AIDs crisis, an illegal emigration crisis, a pollution crisis, and an economic crisis. Given its well-established state and social cohesion, China has far more to gain than to lose from political liberalization. Second, there is a good argument that when there was often no rule at the top, as governance in China will not collapse further even with a top leadership in crisis. The country actually functioned quite normally during the Cultural Revolution, a result of strong local governments and a social fabric that held together. At this state, with protests in full swing, a military on good behavior and a regime trying to confront the possibility of change, there is no reason to believe that the country will abruptly disintegrate. As in 1989, in fact, there is every reason to believe that people will act better toward each other and that local governments will look kindly upon the movement, an outpouring of civic behavior linked with the ideals of democracy. Finally, as above, if we are concerned with the creation of a more just system, then some degree of "chaos" relating to unstable government may be a worthwhile price to pay, including for the world. Claims by some U.S. foreign policy analysts that "there is as great a 'threat' to US interests from a weak and unstable China as there is from a strong and antagonistic China" are based on a highly instrumental and even the flawed view of U.S., and world, interests. A world community committed to the principles of justice through democracy has an overriding interest in its realization in China. To the extent that instability in China worsens conditions for greater justice there or abroad, it would indeed "threaten" world interests. But if the instability, despite its costs, leads to greater gains through a more just order in China and, through it, abroad, then this is very much in the world's interests. Few Americans, French, Croats, Romanians, South Africans, Filipinos, South Koreans, or Indonesians would say the "chaos" of their democratic revolutions was not a price worth paying. China's people should be allowed to make the same choice.

#### Reformed CCP would be able to survive in a democratic China—they will accept democracy if they have to.

Democracy Digest 7 [September 2007, “Chinese Democracy: Too Much of "a Good Thing"?” http://www.demdigest.net/issues/sept07.html]

Party leaders realize that China's citizens will eventually aspire to dignity, participation and self-expression, says Gilley. "All democratic transitions depend on the loss in belief in dictatorship inside the ruling party itself," he argues, a process “now well under way” within the CCP. "Democracy is a Good Thing", wrote party theorist Yu Keping earlier this year while an article in the party-backed Yanhuang Chunqiu journal asserted that "only constitutional democracy can fundamentally solve the ruling party's problems of corruption and graft." Yet a healthy degree of skepticism is justifiable so long as the party continues its monopoly on power and repressive rule. One reason why the CCP has stressed "political order and technocratic governance rather than popular participation and regime transformation," says Dali Yang, is that China remains one of the world's most unequal societies, according to World Bank data. While the party's third generation of leaders opened up political space in the late 1990s, notes Merle Goldman, the fourth generation has "arrested defense lawyers, freelance intellectuals, editors, journalists and cyber-dissidents… [and] reinforced the authoritarian party-state." Gilley, a proponent of actively promoting democracy in China, believes a majority of the party will accept democratization when its Yeltsin moment arrives and that “a reformed CCP could enjoy electoral success in a democratic China.” But the country's transition will not be determined by the party elite alone. The process will be negotiated and contested by diverse interests, notes Yang. China's leaders will need to “learn to lead and even to accommodate an increasingly educated and well-informed populace, with its rising expectations in matters of liberty, political participation, and democratic governance.”

\* Bruce Gilley is Assistant professor of political studies at Queen's University in Canada, and former contributing editor at the Far Eastern Economic Review.

### 1AR—Democracy I/L

#### Social pressure will trigger Chinese democratization—the revolutionary elders and military are no longer in the way.

Goldman 5—Merle Goldman, Professor emeritus of Chinese history at Boston University, and associate of the Fairbank Center for East Asian Research at Harvard University [January 2005, “What's in Store for China,” *Journal of Democracy* 16.1, Project Muse]

Will China become a democratic country within the next twenty years? At present, the lack of opposition political parties, nationwide free elections, the rule of law, a developed civil society, a free press, and an independent middle class, legislature, and judiciary makes the possibility of a democratic China seem far-fetched. Yet Bruce Gilley, a former journalist for the Far Eastern Economic Review, sees such a possibility materializing. In his new book, Gilley supports his thesis by marshaling a number of thoughtful, substantive arguments, presented in a comparative context. He foresees an elite-led process of democratization, spurred by pressures from below but within the context of the well-established Chinese state, unfolding in the early decades of the twenty-first century. Gilley finds prodemocratic legacies in China's premodern history: bureaucratic meritocracy, Confucian accountability, and Buddhist tolerance. He also points to 1912, when the fall of the last imperial dynasty led to the establishment of the Republic of China, and 20 million Chinese voters elected a national government in free and fair elections. Although the results of those elections were nullified by outbursts of warlordism that lasted almost until China's 1949 communist revolution, Gilley expects to see the hundredth anniversary of those elections celebrated with another round of voting in 2012, in a second attempt at founding an enduring democracy in China. There is no question, as Gilley points out, that the post-Mao economic reforms launched in the last two decades of the twentieth century [End Page 168] worked in democracy's favor. As they shifted China away from centralized planning and toward a market economy, these reforms also transformed Chinese society by limiting the government's power, fostering autonomous transactions among individuals, and loosening state control over people's personal lives. Yet despite these changes, Gilley notes, the Leninist "vanguard party" system remains intact. Thus, when students and ordinary citizens demonstrated in Beijing's Tiananmen Square in the spring of 1989, demanding democracy and calling for an end to corruption and inflation, the Mao-generation elders of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) sent in troops on June 4 to suppress the movement with gunfire. Yet, despite the tragic end to the promising events of 1989, Gilley sees them as a prelude to democratization, for they revealed a nascent civil society with global linkages on the issues of democracy and human rights, as well as the first glimmers of negotiations between the regime and the opposition. In the 1990s, accelerating economic reforms unleashed other problems—growing economic, social, and regional inequalities; rampant corruption at every level of government; and unregulated environmental pollution—which have made the move toward democracy, as a way to deal with these problems, all the more urgent. Gilley explains that such obstacles as the CCP's revolutionary elders (most of whom have already died) and the military, which had become neutralized by the start of the twenty-first century, no longer block China's road to democracy. And the growth of a broad and increasingly wealthy middle class has created a new force for democratization. As Gilley explains, "the middle class seeks recognition and protection of its growing interests from the state, mainly through improved legal guarantees and openness." By the turn of the century, this urbanized class accounted for 10 to 15 percent of China's population. Gilley cautions, however, that democratization may be delayed when business interests collude with the authoritarian state. This is already the case in China, as business leaders have begun forming close alliances with officials in a variety of economic endeavors at both the national and local levels. In fact, in the past few years, the CCP has been actively recruiting millions of businesspeople into its ranks, thereby coopting them into the system and making them less likely to be a force for change. Although it is clear that Chinese society has grown stronger since the end of the Mao era in 1976, it has not yet become robust enough to challenge the state: This is still being prevented by continuing clientelist ties between the state and the business community. Thus the main force for political change in China is not the members of the business community but rather the intellectuals on the margins of the establishment—those who were purged from the establishment due to earlier political activism and those forced to become workers or small entrepreneurs. While new laws safeguard the integrity of business transactions, [End Page 169]there is little legislation to protect political and civil activities. People seeking to bring about political change, such as those who in 1998 tried to establish an alternative political party called the China Democracy Party, have met with severe repression; most of their leaders are now in jail. One of the most insightful discussions in Gilley's book considers Chinese political change in comparative perspective. He cites a wide range of sources on the "third wave" of democratization (the transition of dozens of countries from nondemocratic to democratic political systems beginning in the mid-1970s), pointing especially to the success of the new democracies created after the collapse of the communist regimes of Eastern Europe, which he attributes primarily to their precommunist democratic legacies. But as Gilley notes, China differs in some important respects from the third-wave and post-Soviet democracies. Although the country had important democratic thinkers and the beginnings of a civil society in several cities during the early decades of the twentieth century, these developments were repressed during the time of Chiang Kai-shek (1928-49) and then destroyed during Mao's rule. Gilley argues that China at present more resembles the "authoritarian pluralism" that existed in South Korea and Taiwan before their democratic breakthroughs. In both those cases, democracy came about through pressure from below that the top leadership eventually was unable to ignore. Taiwan, for example, began to elect village heads and village councils in the early 1950s, gradually moving these elections to higher administrative levels. At the same time, organized political groups were established and the media began to open up. Thus, when Taiwan's President Chiang Ching-kuo lifted martial law in 1987 and allowed these democratic institutions to flourish, he was only recognizing what in fact already existed.

#### Economic crisis causes democratization.

The Guardian 8—(UK) [6/1/2008, “Why China doesn't break,” http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/jun/01/whychinadoesntbreak]

The CCP has conducted a tireless and largely successful campaign to co-opt, and in many respects create, the rising educated and economic classes. By remaining the key economic player as well as overseeing an extensive system of awards, promotions, and regulation, the government continues to control and dispense a dominant share of the most valued economic, professional, and intellectual opportunities. This means that entrepreneurs are better off doing business as a "partner" of the state. Intellectuals and academics favoured by officials are granted generous research grants, are fast tracked into senior positions, and given personal perks. Journalists have little choice but to work for media outlets that are still subsidiaries of party organs. These are the contented middle classes emerging in China today. Far from being an independent class, why would these middle classes want to change toward a more democratic system when it could lead to their own dispossession? The CCP's hold on power remains vulnerable to a profound economic shock, such as a significant downturn in economic growth. This would impede the regime's continued capacity to co-opt and appease. Regardless, a Chinese middle class that looks and acts the same as we do in the west might nevertheless think very differently when it comes to democracy and the future of the country.