### Case

**No circumvention – review mechanism distributes power and insulates from pressure**

**Siegel 12** - Senior Editor for UCLA Law Review, UCLA Law Review, April, 2012, 59 UCLA L. Rev. 1076Reconciling Caperton and Citizens United: When Campaign Spending Should Compel Recusal of Elected Officials, Samuel P. Siegel
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The influence of campaign expenditures is further lessened when an adjudicatory decision is made by a **group of executive officials**, even if each of those officials is directly accountable to the elected official. For example, the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States - comprised of top-ranking officials from various executive departments n258 - is a body authorized by Congress to screen and investigate foreign-investment proposals "to determine the effects of the transaction on the national security of the United States," n259 negotiate mitigation agreements with foreign investors to minimize national security concerns, n260 and, should mitigation efforts fail, recommend to the president that she block the [\*1119] deal, n261 powers that are "like individual adjudications (or quasi-adjudications)." n262 Yet the very fact that a committee, rather than a single officer, exercises this adjudicatory power **insulates its decisions from presidential control**: "With a single agency, the President could credibly threaten to remove or otherwise pressure or discipline that agency's Secretary or Administrator. **But there is strength in numbers**." n263 Thus, **even within a unitary executive**, such a structure **would likely temper** the **influence** that campaign expenditures would have on the outcome of an adjudication.

#### Unique risk now of global democratic backsliding---authoritarianism is accelerating

Benhabib et al 13 Seyla Benhabib is the Eugene Meyer Professor of Political Science and Philosophy at Yale University, Kateryna Pishchikova is research fellow at the Scuola Superiore Sant’Anna in Pisa, Anna Dolidze is a Visiting Assistant Professor of Law at the University of Western Ontario, Richard Youngs is director general of FRIDE. Gabor Halmai is a professor of law and director of the Institute for Political and International Studies at Eötvös Lóránd University, Budapest,David Cameron is Professor of Political Science and Chair of the Political Science Department at the University of Toronto,Gunther Hellmann is Professor of Political Science at Johann Wolfgang Goethe UniversityMay 2, 2013, "NEW REPORT: U.S., EUROPEAN COUNTRIES TAKEN TO TASK FOR DEMOCRATIC POLARIZATION, BACKSLIDING" www.transatlanticacademy.org/publications/us-european-countries-taken-task-democratic-polarization-backsliding

A study released today by the Transatlantic Academy reveals that North America and Europe are facing an increasingly worrying and severe democratic disconnect. In Europe, serious democratic backsliding can be seen in a number of countries, and the distance between ordinary citizens and the politicians and bureaucrats in Brussels compromises democratic legitimacy. The problem is not one of polarization, but the absence of space for effective democratic decision-making in the face of markets and international institutions. In contrast, in the United States gridlock and polarization are growing more extreme, and in Canada there is concern that the political system places largely unaccountable power in the hands of the prime minister. Democratic governments on both sides of the Atlantic are neither as responsive nor as accountable as they need to be in an era of hard choices and rising non-democratic powers. The Democratic Disconnect – Citizenship and Accountability in the Transatlantic Community, the 2012 collaborative report by North American and European fellows of the Transatlantic Academy, analyzes the state and future of the liberal order in the Atlantic community. It assesses the new challenges, dangers, and opportunities faced by Western governments and civil societies as they confront severe economic and financial constraints, demographic shifts, and an increasingly globalized, multipolar world. The study argues that the solution to democracy’s crisis lies in reinvigorating liberalism, not in searching for or accepting the inevitability of authoritarianism. Western democracy can and must be renewed, and the starting point should be a focus on reconnecting citizens with their public institutions. “Democratic crises are not new but what is different today is the cumulative and accelerating impact of globalization, technology and markets on democratic accountability and concepts of citizenship. The major trends and challenges behind this new democratic crisis is what the Transatlantic Academy fellows grapple with in this study, as they offer ways for the transatlantic community to reinvigorate its democracies,” said Stephen F. Szabo, executive director of the Transatlantic Academy, in introducing the study.

#### Chinese identity has already been established – attempting to wish away social constructions are anti-historical. Strategic alterations within the current US-China relationship is key to prevent war.

Jennifer STERLING-FOLKER Poli Sci @ Connecticut (Stamford) AND Rosemary SHINKO IR @ Connecticut (Stamford) ‘5 “Discourses of Power: Traversing the Realist-Postmodern Divide” Millennium 33 (3) p. 658-660

Granting that postmodernism is seeking out the sources for radical change in and of the Westphalian sovereign system, how else are sources for reinscripting to become translated into change in the Chinese-Taiwanese relationship except via the nations of China and Taiwan, their respective states, and the **strategic relationship** they share with the US? Doesn't the Taiwanese state also protect identity difference from Chinese repression? Collective identities may be **socially-constructed**, but their content can still be **zero-sum.** What would it have meant for the individuals of Taiwan in the 1970s to have refused the national, territorial security discourses of realism and to have embraced identity tolerance with China instead? Certainly the latter could only have been achieved by embracing China on its own terms, and so it would have involved the political and economic subjugation of the Taiwanese people to Beijing. The vast majority of Taiwanese were already victims of identity intolerance at, the hands of the Nationalist KMT, but they were neither Mandarin-speaking, nor did they identify with the Chinese mainland. Although the KMT were initially welcomed by the Taiwanese population as liberators from the Japanese occupation, Soong notes that 'the expectation that Taiwanese could now share power with their "mainland brothers" was crushed by the KMT'." Clashes and civil unrest ensued over KMT authoritarianism, corruption, and favoritism, and in 1947 the KMT declared martial law. The formation of political parties was banned, the military was given considerable legal and censorship powers, thousands of opponents were executed, and for the next thirty-five years Taiwan became a virtual police state dominated by Mainlanders who insisted that Mandarin be the official language. While the KMT remained obsessed with returning to mainland China, it was not a goal shared by many Taiwanese. Those who dreamt of Taiwanese independence from China developed underground or overseas movements that later evolved into the DPP. There was little desire among the majority of Taiwanese to embrace identity tolerance with China on the latter's terms. Simultaneously, there was the possibility of greater participation in the political institutions of Taiwan itself. For the Taiwanese, at that moment, to have refused the national, territorial security discourses of IR in favor of ambiguity and tolerance would have been to refuse the very identity and goals that distinguished them from the KMT and mainland Chinese (and for which many of them had suffered). It would have meant a refusal of themselves, which hardly seems likely or even desirable. As Elshtain puts it, 'we are dealing with identities, remember, not easily sloughed off external garments'." To say that if the Taiwanese stop thinking of China as a problem then tensions will dissolve is true in an abstract sense but not in any **practical** sense for the vast majority of **people who live these identities**. It was the Taiwanese desire to embrace statehood and the Parameters of the Westphalian system that, along with US strategic deterrence, prevented a Chinese invasion of Taiwan. To argue that the individuals of Taiwan would be safer if they refused statehood is to Ignore the Chinese commitment since 1949 to subjugate Taiwan according to its own identity parameters. It is also to ignore the desire of the vast majority of Taiwanese not to be subjugated according to those parameters. The ROC would not even exist if it had not been for classic balance-of-power politics between two nation-states, the US and China, in the context of the early Cold War. Its evolution into a democracy is just as indebted to its relationship with the US, since it was the US decision to improve its relations with China in the 1970s that forced the KMT to pursue democratisation as means of national consciousness. Simultaneously, the goal of Taiwanese nation-state building was to confirm for other nation-states that the ROC had a legitimate claim to sovereignty (in opposition to China's claim that it is only a province), because the ROC government has the legitimate support of its population. Hence the increasing identity tolerance between Taiwan and China has only been realised through **the avenues and mechanisms of national identity politics** and the governing institutions of China and Taiwan, not outside or beyond them. Certainly nations have the option of refusing to become nation-states, but it would make little sense for nations and the individuals who comprise them to do so, when those parameters promise control over a specified territory via intra-national decision-making institutions. This is why civil wars are endemic to the Westphalian system and why nations will pursue statehood even when they are, in relative terms, politically and economically comfortable. If we don't examine particular, historical contexts, identities, and institutions — that is, if we insist upon, in Morgenthau's words, the 'neglect of the contingencies of history and of the concreteness of historical situations'" — then we will miss the way in which radical ideas **work through and shape existing institutions and practices**, and are in turn shaped by them. Thus we will miss the most essential link between that which changes (namely, history), and what remains the same (namely, structure).

#### Syria doesn’t undermine cred but indefinite detention does

Daily Kos 9/8/13 “Red Lines, Deadlines, and "Credibility" on the World Stage: Syria vs. Gitmo,” http://www.dailykos.com/story/2013/09/08/1237401/-Red-Lines-Deadlines-and-Credibility-on-the-World-Stage-Syria-vs-Gitmo

There's an argument out there, favored by many of the usual hawks, that asserts Obama simply must bomb Syria lest he and the United lose "credibility." He set a "red line," and the failure to adhere to it would make the U.S. look weak, never mind the U.S.'s unnecessarily large arsenal of nuclear weapons and massive defense budget. Those, of course, are insufficient deterrents.¶ Obama has been trying to weasel out of his past statement, not by changing the definition of "red line" (which should come easy to a legally trained mind), but by claiming that "humanity" set the red line. Humanity, insofar as it has ever been organized, established the UN Charter, and that bans threatening to attack other nations when not in self-defense. But, for the purpose of this discussion, let's look at the UN conventions as moral commands established by "humanity."¶ If you want an example of lost "credibility" along with the flouting of red lines set by "humanity" and deadlines set by the president, look at Gitmo.¶ On January 22, 2009, after taking office, one of the first things that President Barack Obama did was issue an executive order calling for the closure of the detention facility in Guantanamo Bay in one year:¶ Sec. 3. Closure of Detention Facilities at Guantánamo. The detention facilities at Guantánamo for individuals covered by this order shall be closed as soon as practicable, and no later than 1 year from the date of this order. If any individuals covered by this order remain in detention at Guantánamo at the time of closure of those detention facilities, they shall be returned to their home country, released, transferred to a third country, or transferred to another United States detention facility in a manner consistent with law and the national security and foreign policy interests of the United States.¶ The Guantanamo Bay detention facility had long been violating the United Nations Convention Against Torture, of which the U.S. is one of 153 parties. Back in 2006, United Nations human rights investigators called for the facility to be closed:¶ UNITED NATIONS, Feb. 16 — United Nations human rights investigators called on the United States today to shut down the Guantánamo Bay camp and give detainees quick trials or release them, but the White House promptly dismissed the report.¶ Arguing that many of the interrogation and detention practices constituted abuses amounting to torture, the report stated, "The United States government should close the Guantánamo Bay detention facilities without further delay."¶ ....¶ It also expresses "utmost concern" at "attempts by the United States administration to redefine 'torture' in the framework of the struggle against terrorism in order to allow certain interrogation techniques that would not be permitted under the internationally accepted definition of torture."¶ ....¶ The report said that the "executive branch of the United States government operates as judge, prosecutor and defense counsel of the Guantánamo Bay detainees" and asserted that this constituted "serious violations of various guarantees of the right to a fair trial."¶ If Obama thinks that "humanity" set a "red line" with the Chemical Weapons Convention, then he must think that "humanity" did so with the Convention against Torture (and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment).¶ As of the date of Obama's executive order, the U.S. had faced no punishment for violating this "red line" set by humanity. It still has not.¶ What came after Obama set a firm goal of closing Guantanamo in one year? Did the President and his cabinet engage in a vigorous lobbying campaign to get Democrats in the House and Senate on board?¶ No.¶ “Rahm Emmanuel’s basic view was that he thought this was a crazy waste of political capital. That was a signal to the rest of the bureaucracy, ‘Don’t expose yourself on this,’” one person involved in the discussions said. “There was more that could be done. But once it became clear that the White House was no longer investing, everyone got the message.”¶ The White House forbade Justice and State Department officials from even going to Capitol Hill to meet with Democrats for much of 2009, over the objections of senior officials in those departments.¶ Did the President and his advisers aggressively use the media to push for the closure of the detention facility, booking prime-time interviews with every major outlet, sending surrogates to all of the Sunday shows, and speaking to the public directly from the Oval Office? No.¶ The Senate did, as you probably remember, vote down a proposal sent to them by Obama to close Gitmo. However, his proposal would have just relocated the facility without changing the practices. Here's Glenn Greenwald in Salon:¶ When the President finally unveiled his plan for “closing Guantanamo,” it became clear that it wasn’t a plan to “close” the camp as much as it was a plan simply to re-locate it — import it — onto American soil, at a newly purchased federal prison in Thompson, Illinois. William Lynn, Obama’s Deputy Defense Secretary, sent a letter to inquiring Senators that expressly stated that the Obama administration intended to continue indefinitely to imprison some of the detainees with no charges of any kind. The plan was classic Obama: a pretty, feel-good, empty symbolic gesture (get rid of the symbolic face of Bush War on Terror excesses) while preserving the core abuses (the powers of indefinite detention ), even strengthening and expanding those abuses by bringing them into the U.S.¶ But did he even need to go to the Senate? Earlier this year, legal scholar Eric Posner wrote an article for Slate entitled "President Obama Can Shut Guantanamo Whenever He Wants". Here's what he had to say:¶ President Obama can lawfully release the detainees if he wants to. Congress has made it difficult, but not impossible. Whatever he’s saying, the president does not want to close the detention center—at least not yet.¶ The relevant law is the National Defense Authorization Act of 2012 (NDAA). This statute confirms the president’s power to wage war against al-Qaida and its associates, which was initially given to him in the Authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF) passed shortly after 9/11. The NDAA also authorizes the president to detain enemy combatants, and bans him from transferring Guantanamo detainees to American soil.¶ The NDAA does not, however, ban the president from releasing detainees. Section 1028 authorizes him to release them to foreign countries that will accept them—the problem is that most countries won’t, and others, like Yemen, where about 90 of the 166 detainees are from, can’t guarantee that they will maintain control over detainees, as required by the law.¶ There is another section of the NDAA, however, which has been overlooked. In section 1021(a), Congress “affirms” the authority of the U.S. armed forces under the AUMF to detain members of al-Qaida and affiliated groups “pending disposition under the law of war.” Section 1021(c)(1) further provides that “disposition under the law of war” includes “Detention under the law of war without trial until the end of the hostilities authorized by” the AUMF. Thus, when hostilities end, the detainees may be released.¶ The president has the power to end the hostilities with al-Qaida—simply by declaring their end. This is not a controversial sort of power. Numerous presidents have ended hostilities without any legislative action from Congress—this happened with the Vietnam War, the Korean War, World War II, and World War I. The Supreme Court has confirmed that the president has this authority.¶ (You can go to Slate to read the full article).¶ In other words, through his powers as commander-in-chief, he could do quite a lot to realize his past commitment to close Gitmo. He has chosen not to use such powers.¶ If the president wanted to restore his and the nation's "credibility" on the world stage and show that the president's deadlines have weight and human rights rhetoric has substance, then he should be making the closure of Guantanamo an immediate priority. There would be far more "credibility"--constitutional, moral, international--gained than would be by bombing a new country.

#### Legitimacy’s the fundamental internal link to effective hegemony---power distributions perceived as illegitimate are the most likely causes of great power war

Martha Finnemore 9, professor of political science and international affairs at George Washington University, January 2009, “Legitimacy, Hypocrisy, and the Social Structure of Unipolarity: Why Being a Unipole Isn’t All It’s Cracked Up to Be,” World Politics, Volume 61, Number 1

Legitimacy is, by its nature, a social and relational phenomenon. One’s position or power cannot be legitimate in a vacuum. The concept only has meaning in a particular social context. Actors, even unipoles, cannot create legitimacy unilaterally. Legitimacy can only be given by others. It is conferred either by peers, as when great powers accept or reject the actions of another power, or by those upon whom power is exercised. Reasons to confer legitimacy have varied throughout history. Tradition, blood, and claims of divine right have all provided reasons to confer legitimacy, although in contemporary politics conformity with [End Page 61] international norms and law is more influential in determining which actors and actions will be accepted as legitimate. 9¶ Recognizing the legitimacy of power does not mean these others necessarily like the powerful or their policies, but it implies at least tacit acceptance of the social structure in which power is exercised. One may not like the inequalities of global capitalism but still believe that markets are the only realistic or likely way to organize successful economic growth. One may not like the P5 vetoes of the Security Council but still understand that the United Nations cannot exist without this concession to power asymmetries. We can see the importance of legitimacy by thinking about its absence. Active rejection of social structures and the withdrawal of recognition of their legitimacy create a crisis. In domestic politics, regimes suffering legitimacy crises face resistance, whether passive or active and armed. Internationally, systems suffering legitimacy crises tend to be violent and noncooperative. Post-Reformation Europe might be an example of such a system. Without at least tacit acceptance of power’s legitimacy, the wheels of international social life get derailed. Material force alone remains to impose order, and order creation or maintenance by that means is difficult, even under unipolarity. Successful and stable orders require the grease of some legitimation structure to persist and prosper.10¶ The social and relational character of legitimacy thus strongly colors the nature of any unipolar order and the kinds of orders a unipole can construct. Yes, unipoles can impose their will, but only to an extent. The willingness of others to recognize the legitimacy of a unipole’s actions and defer to its wishes or judgment shapes the character of the order that will emerge. Unipolar power without any underlying legitimacy will have a very particular character. The unipole’s policies will meet with resistance, either active or passive, at every turn. Cooperation will be induced only through material quid pro quo payoffs. Trust will be thin to nonexistent. This is obviously an expensive system to run and few unipoles have tried to do so.

#### Securitizing discourse in the context of climate change is the only way to -> change

**Barnett** '1 Jon is with the Macmillan Brown Centre for Pacific Studies, University of Canterbury (Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, "Security and Climate Change, October 2001)

Despite these problems with any potential climate-change security discourse, it may nevertheless have some utility. Security communicates a certain gravitas that is arguably necessary in climate change policy. In that climate change is a security problem for certain groups, identifying it as such suggests that it is an issue that warrants a policy response commensurate in effort if not in kind with war. A critical and ambiguous concept in the UNFCCC is its reference to ‘dangerous’ levels of climate change. Because it is an accentuated discourse on vulnerability, security encapsulates danger much better than concepts such as sustainability, vulnerability or adaptation, and it offers a framework in which danger can be recast as widespread risks to welfare and (in the case of small island states) sovereignty. Security can also serve as an integrative concept which links local (human security), national (national security) and global (international security) levels of environmental change and response. It also integrates mitigation and adaptation as both are essential to security from climate risks. Finally, understanding processes that render groups insecure – and climate change is but one of these – brings to the fore issues of equity and the operation of the international political-economy. Further, although it should not be overstated, security addresses the possibility of violent social upheaval. It also brings military expenditure and its environmental impacts into consideration. The ability of conventional national security discourse and policy to appropriate climate change is a matter of how climate security risks are understood, and who talks about them.

### 2ac

#### Legal reforms restrain the cycle of violence and prevent error replication

Colm O’Cinneide 8, Senior Lecturer in Law at University College London, “Strapped to the Mast: The Siren Song of Dreadful Necessity, the United Kingdom Human Rights Act and the Terrorist Threat,” Ch 15 in Fresh Perspectives on the ‘War on Terror,’ ed. Miriam Gani and Penelope Mathew, <http://epress.anu.edu.au/war_terror/mobile_devices/ch15s07.html>

This ‘symbiotic’ relationship between counter-terrorism measures and political violence, and the apparently inevitable negative impact of the use of emergency powers upon ‘target’ communities, would indicate that it makes sense to be very cautious in the use of such powers. However, the impact on individuals and ‘target’ communities can be too easily disregarded when set against the apparent demands of the greater good. Justice Jackson’s famous quote in Terminiello v Chicago [111] that the United States Bill of Rights should not be turned into a ‘suicide pact’ has considerable resonance in times of crisis, and often is used as a catch-all response to the ‘bleatings’ of civil libertarians.[112] The structural factors discussed above that appear to drive the response of successive UK governments to terrorist acts seem to invariably result in a depressing repetition of mistakes.¶ However, certain legal processes appear to have some capacity to slow down the excesses of the counter-terrorism cycle. What is becoming apparent in the UK context since 9/11 is that there are factors at play this time round that were not in play in the early years of the Northern Irish crisis. A series of parliamentary, judicial and transnational mechanisms are now in place that appear to have some moderate ‘dampening’ effect on the application of emergency powers.¶ This phrase ‘dampening’ is borrowed from Campbell and Connolly, who have recently suggested that law can play a ‘dampening’ role on the progression of the counter-terrorism cycle before it reaches its end. Legal processes can provide an avenue of political opportunity and mobilisation in their own right, whereby the ‘relatively autonomous’ framework of a legal system can be used to moderate the impact of the cycle of repression and backlash. They also suggest that this ‘dampening’ effect can ‘re-frame’ conflicts in a manner that shifts perceptions about the need for the use of violence or extreme state repression.[113] State responses that have been subject to this dampening effect may have more legitimacy and generate less repression: the need for mobilisation in response may therefore also be diluted.

#### Perm do the plan and all non-competitive parts of the alt – the state coopts the alt

McCormack 10 (Tara, is Lecturer in International Politics at the University of Leicester and has a PhD in International Relations from the University of Westminster. 2010, (Critique, Security and Power: The political limits to emancipatory approaches, page 59-61)

In chapter 7 I engaged with the human security framework and some of the problematic implications of ‘emancipatory’ security policy frameworks. In this chapter I argued that the shift away from the pluralist security framework and the elevation of cosmopolitan and emancipatory goals has served to enforce international power inequalities rather than lessen them. Weak or unstable states are subjected to greater international scrutiny and international institutions and other states have greater freedom to intervene, but the citizens of these states have no way of controlling or influencing these international institutions or powerful states. This shift away from the pluralist security framework has not challenged the status quo, which may help to explain why major international institutions and states can easily adopt a more cosmopolitan rhetoric in their security policies. As we have seen, the shift away from the pluralist security framework has entailed a shift towards a more openly hierarchical international system, in which states are differentiated according to, for example, their ability to provide human security for their citizens or their supposed democratic commitments. In this shift, the old pluralist international norms of (formal) international sovereign equality, non-intervention and ‘blindness’ to the content of a state are overturned. Instead, international institutions and states have more freedom to intervene in weak or unstable states in order to ‘protect’ and emancipate individuals globally. Critical and emancipatory security theorists argue that the goal of the emancipation of the individual means that security must be reconceptualised away from the state. As the domestic sphere is understood to be the sphere of insecurity and disorder, the international sphere represents greater emancipatory possibilities, as Tickner argues, ‘if security is to start with the individual, its ties to state sovereignty must be severed’ (1995: 189). For critical and emancipatory theorists there must be a shift towards a ‘cosmopolitan’ legal framework, for example Mary Kaldor (2001: 10), Martin Shaw (2003: 104) and Andrew Linklater (2005). For critical theorists, one of the fundamental problems with Realism is that it is unrealistic. Because it prioritises order and the existing status quo, Realism attempts to impose a particular security framework onto a complex world, ignoring the myriad threats to people emerging from their own governments and societies. Moreover, traditional international theory serves to obscure power relations and omits a study of why the system is as it is: [O]mitting myriad strands of power amounts to exaggerating the simplicity of the entire political system. Today’s conventional portrait of international politics thus too often ends up looking like a Superman comic strip, whereas it probably should resemble a Jackson Pollock. (Enloe, 2002 [1996]: 189) Yet as I have argued, contemporary critical security theorists seem to show a marked lack of engagement with their problematic (whether the international security context, or the Yugoslav break-up and wars). Without concrete engagement and analysis, however, the critical project is undermined and critical theory becomes nothing more than a request that people behave in a nicer way to each other. Furthermore, whilst contemporary critical security theorists argue that they present a more realistic image of the world, through exposing power relations, for example, their lack of concrete analysis of the problematic considered renders them actually unable to engage with existing power structures and the way in which power is being exercised in the contemporary international system. For critical and emancipatory theorists the central place of the values of the theorist mean that it cannot fulfil its promise to critically engage with contemporary power relations and emancipatory possibilities. Values must be joined with engagement with the material circumstances of the time.

#### Desecuritization is not emancipatory---it’s worse for every tangible impact they isolate

Nunes 7 – Joao Reis Nunes, Marie Curie Fellow and Ph. D. Candidate in International Politics at University of Wales, Aberystwyth, September 2007, “Politics, Security, Critical Theory: A Contribution to Current Debates on Security,” online: <http://archive.sgir.eu/uploads/Nunes-joaonunes-politicssecuritycriticaltheory.pdf>

Yet, not all of the proponents of CSS would agree that security is something that needs to be ‘unmade’. In Fact, one of the theoreticalapproaches cited by the manifesto as an important inspiration—the Welsh School – has consistently argued that security is something that needs to be archived, promoted, and not replaced by something else. The manifesto has solved this contradiction by arguing that, in the Welsh School, security is ‘distinguished from order and power and redefinged as inclusive of individuals’ (2006:456). This is a fairly accurate view of the Welsh School’s understanding of the value of security; however, a deeper investigation of security-politics nexus implicit in this approach is needed, so that the debate is able to conceive viable theoretical alternatives to the predominant views described above.¶ Security and politics in the Welsh School¶ Several questions spring to mind when one faces the work of the Welsh School from the standpoint of other critical approaches. One of the most pressing is: why security? Why focus on such a loaded and manifestly dangerous term, a term that has been so often instrumentalized with the objective of justifying highly questionable practices? Can it be that the different critical approaches are talking about the same things, but with different names? Take the focus of the Welsh School on emancipation, for example (Booth 1991 and 1999a, Wyn Jones 2005): can it be placed on the same level of desecuritization, as Aradau (2004) has suggested? To use the words of the c.a.s.e. manifesto, can the politics of normality (desecuritization) and the politics of normativity (emancipation) be seen as two alternative or complementary pathways to ‘unmaking security’?¶ It is consensual to argue that both of these strands definitely wish to ‘unmake security’, if by security one means an exceptionalist domain of violent and exclusionary practices. However, there are reasons as to why the Welsh School does not wish to get rid of the term ‘security’ – and that is why desecuritization cannot lead to emancipation. For the Welsh School, security in itself has an important normative value that needs to be maintained. This understanding of the value of security is intrinsically connected with an account of security-politics nexus that is at odds with the understandings that have achieved particular importance in the field.¶ It must be said that the Welsh School has not engaged systematically with its own theoretical assumptions regarding the security-politics nexus. This reluctance results from a particularly pragmatic approach to the ‘realities’ of security. Booth defined traditional approaches as a form of self-deception, an ‘escape from the real’ (1995:105), and even a ‘theology’ and a set of ‘rites’ (1999b:45). As a consequence, CSS must aim at ‘engag[ing] comprehensively with the real’ (2004:8), that is, it must take into account the ‘real lives in real places in that real world which academic international relations realists disregard’ (1995:123).¶ This comprehensive engagement is connected with a normative commitment to confront the materiality of what Booth terms ‘human wrongs’, ‘facts’ that dominate politics in a global scale and that can be said to constitute the ‘subject-matter’ of security studies: ‘The subject-matter consists of flesh (which is fed or famished) and blood (which is wet and messy, and hot or cold), and people living lives comfortably and securely, or enduring them against the wall, like a dog’ (1995:105).¶ The crude emotion present in this description of what security studies ‘is all about’ must not be mistaken for poetic idealism: Booth has been quite consistent in his efforts to pin down security studies to a particular materiality, thereby eschewing a purely discursive critique of security. Williams (1999) has noted that the version of CSS put forward by Booth claims to be “better’ than others because of its improved ‘realism’, that is, its ability to engage with the factuality of human wrongs. This is why Booth, to the obvious disappointment of other critical security theorists who wish to put into question notions of reality and reason, consistently describes his approach as more realistic and rational that the others14.

[CSS=Critical Security Studies]

**Opening up space for new ways of knowing won't affect international violence**

**O'Callaghan, lecturer in IR, 02** (Terry , lecturer in the school of International Relations at the University of South Australia, International Relations and the third debate, ed: Jarvis, 2002, p. 80-81)

There are also a host of technological and logistical questions that plague George's scheme and make problematic his recommendations. For example, through what medium are those on the fringes of the international system going to speak to the world? Although it may be true that the third world has now been integrated into the global polity via the advent of technological innovations in communications, allowing for remote access to information sources and the Internet, it also remains true that the majority of those on the fringes continue to be disenfranchised from such mediums, whether as a result of a lack of economic resources, the prevalence of illiteracy, or social, cultural and political circumstances that systemically exclude, women (among others) from economic resources and certain political and social freedoms. Need we remind George that social, political, and individual autonomy is at a minimum in these parts of the world, and an intellectual approach as controversial as postmodernism is not likely to achieve the sorts of goals that George optimistically foreshadows. Indeed, on practical questions such as these, matters otherwise central to the success of postmodern visions, George prefers to be vague, suggesting instead that the intricacies of such details will somehow work themselves out in a manner satisfactory to all. Such a position reveals George's latent idealism and underscores how George's schema is an intellectual one: a theory of international politics written for other theorists of international politics. George's audience is thus a very limited and elite audience and begs the question of whether a senior, middle-class scholar in the intellectual heartland of Australia can do anything of real substance to aid the truly marginalized and oppressed. How is it possible to put oneself in the shoes of the "other," to advocate on his or her behalf, when such is done from a position of affluence, unrelated to and far removed from the experiences of those whom George otherwise champions? Ideals are all good and well, but it is hard to imagine that the computer keyboard is mightier than the sword, and hard to see how a small, elite, affluent assortment of intellectuals is going to generate the type of political momentum necessary to allow those on the fringes to speak and be heard! 1 . Moreover, why should we assume that states and individuals want to listen and will listen to what the marginalized and the oppressed have to say? There is precious little evidence to suggest that "listening" is something the advanced capitalist countries do very well at all. Indeed, one of the allegations so forcefully alleged by Muslim fundamentalists as justification for the terrorist attacks of September I I is precisely that the West, and America in particular, are deaf to the disenfranchised and impoverished in the world. Certainly, there are agencies and individuals who are sensitive to the needs of the "marginalized" and who champion institutional forums where indigenous voices can be heard. But on even the most optimistic reckoning, such forums and institutions represent the exception, not the rule, and remain in the minority if not dwarfed by those institutions that represent Western, first world interests. To be sure, this is a realist power-political image of the current configuration of the global polity, but one apparently, and ironically, endorsed by George if only because it speaks to the realities of the marginalized, the imposed silences, and the multitude of oppressions on which George founds his call for a postmodern ethic. Recognizing such realities, however, does not explain George's penchant for ignoring them entirely, especially in terms of the structural rigidities they pose for meaningful reform. Indeed, George's desire to move to a new "space beyond International Relations" smacks of wishful idealism, ignoring the current configuration of global political relations and power distribution; of the incessant ideological power of hyperindividualism, consumerism, advertising, Hollywood images, and fashion icons; and of the innate power bestowed on the (institutional) barons of global finance, trade, and transnational production. George seems to have little appreciation of the structural impediments such institutions pose for radical change of the type he so fiercely advocates. Revolutionary change of the kind desired by George ignores that fact that many individuals are not disposed to concerns beyond their family, friends, and daily work lives. And institutional, structural transformation requires organized effort, mass popular support, and dogged single-mindedness if societal norms are to be challenged, institutional reform enacted, consumer tastes altered, and political sensibilities reformed. Convincing Nike that there is something intrinsically wrong with paying Indonesian workers a few dollars a week to manufacture shoes for the global market requires considerably more effort than postmodern platitudes and/or moral indignation. The cycle of wealth creation and distribution that sees Michael Jordan receive multimillion dollar contracts to inspire demand for Nike products, while the foot soldiers in the factory eke out a meager existence producing these same products is not easily, or realistically, challenged by pronouncements of moving beyond International Relations to a new, nicer, gentler nirvana. More generally, of course, what George fails to consider is the problem of apathy and of how we get people to care about the plight of others. What do we with the CEOs of multinational corporations, stockbrokers, accountants, ctory workers, and the unemployed, who, by and large, fail to consider the omeless and destitute in their own countries, let alone in places they have never isited and are never likely to visit? Moral indignation rarely translates into action, and apathy about the plight of others is a structural impediment as strong any idea, theory, or writing. What George's treatise thus fails to consider is how we overcome this, and how we get others to listen. He needs to explain how the social, political, psychological, and moral structures that define the parameters of existence for the many millions of ordinary citizens in the first world, and that deflects attention from the marginalized and the oppressed can be broken down. Unfortunately, there is little to indicate that George has thought much about this, suggesting that his commitment to postmodern theory is not likely to make much difference. In fact, in the academy the postmodern light is already beginning to dim in certain quarters, having registered scarcely a glimmer in the broader polity, where, if change was to ensue, it needed to burn brightly. Even among those versed in the nomenclature of scholarly debate, theorists of international politics remain skeptical of the value of postmodern discourse, by and large rejecting it. This does not portend well for postmodern visionaries and the future of postmodern discourse. But can George really be surprised by this? After all, his discourse indicts the "backward discipline" for complicity in crimes against humanity, calling for a repudiation of realism and with it a repudiation of the lifelong beliefs and writings of eminent theorists like Kenneth Waltz, Robert Gilpin, and Stephen Krasner who have otherwise defined the parameters of the discipline, its projects, and research agendas. Can George really expect discipline-wide capitulation to an intellectual diaspora that would see theorists repudiate their beliefs and works in order to take up the creed of postmodernism, as vague, open-ended, and indeterminate as it is? Without a clear and credible plan of how to get from "incarceration and closure" to intellectual freedom, creativity, and openness, George's postmodern musings have understandably attracted few disciples.

#### Rejecting predictions is worse---causes the gut-checks of policy-makers to fill the void

Fitzsimmons 7 Michael, Defense Analyst in DC, “The Problem of Uncertainty in Strategic Planning”, Survival, Winter 06/07

But handling even this weaker form of uncertainty is still quite challeng- ing. If not sufficiently bounded, a high degree of variability in planning factors can exact a significant price on planning. The complexity presented by great variability strains the cognitive abilities of even the most sophisticated decision- makers.15 And even a robust decision-making process sensitive to cognitive limitations necessarily sacrifices depth of analysis for breadth as variability and complexity grows. It should follow, then, that in planning under conditions of risk, variability in strategic calculation should be carefully tailored to available analytic and decision processes. Why is this important? What harm can an imbalance between complexity and cognitive or analytic capacity in strategic planning bring? Stated simply, where analysis is silent or inadequate, **the personal beliefs of decision-makers** **fill the void**. As political scientist Richard Betts found in a study of strategic sur- prise, in ‘an environment that lacks clarity, abounds with conflicting data, and allows no time for rigorous assessment of sources and validity, ambiguity allows intuition or wishfulness to drive interpretation ... The greater the ambiguity, the greater the impact of preconceptions.’16 The decision-making environment that Betts describes here is one of political-military crisis, not long-term strategic planning. But a strategist who sees uncertainty as the central fact of his environ- ment brings upon himself some of the pathologies of crisis decision-making. He invites ambiguity, takes conflicting data for granted and **substitutes a priori scepticism about the validity of prediction** for time pressure as a rationale for discounting the importance of analytic rigour. It is important not to exaggerate the extent to which data and ‘rigorous assessment’ can illuminate strategic choices. Ambiguity is a fact of life, and scepticism of analysis is necessary. Accordingly, the intuition and judgement of decision-makers will always be vital to strategy, and attempting to subordinate those factors to some formulaic, deterministic decision-making model would be both undesirable and unrealistic. All the same, there is danger in the opposite extreme as well. Without careful analysis of what is relatively likely and what is relatively unlikely, what will be the possible bases for strategic choices? A decision-maker with no faith in prediction is left with little more than a set of worst-case scenarios and his existing beliefs about the world to confront the choices before him. Those beliefs may be more or less well founded, but if they are not made explicit and subject to analysis and debate regarding their application to particular strategic contexts, they remain only beliefs and premises, rather than rational judgements. Even at their best, such decisions are likely to be poorly understood by the organisations charged with their implementation. At their worst, such decisions may be poorly understood by the decision-makers themselves.

#### The K is a non-falsifiable ideological conspiracy theory

**Jones and Smith, June 2011** (David Martin, Senior Lecturer, School of Political Science and International Studies, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia, M.L.R., Department of War Studies, King's College, University of London, London, United Kingdom, “Terrorology and Methodology: A Reply to Dixit and Stump,” Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, Volume 34, issue 6)

In our original review we particularly took issue with the belief, held by a number of contributors to Critical Studies on Terrorism, and reflected in British and Australian university programs, that conventional terrorism research deliberately conspires both to de-legitimize the critical voice and marginalize the non-Western “other.” In this regard, we found that critical theory engages in sweeping generalizations about the Western media presentation of terrorism and assumes or cherry picks facts to demonstrate political bias and a predetermined state conspiracy. Such a critical worldview again unconsciously mirrors the weakness of traditional terror studies during the Cold War, where writers like Claire Sterling in The Terror Network detected the hidden-hand of the Soviet Union behind every significant violent sub-state actor of the time. As we stated in our review, conventional and critical approaches often seem two sides of the same debased coin. More generally, the soi disant critical orientation of Critical Studies on Terrorism embraces the uncritical assumption that Western democracies have engaged in a conspiracy to demonize resistance by third world and particularly Muslim non-state actors. The critical approach thus places the assumption of the questionable and malign motivation of democratic governments (that nevertheless, and somewhat ironically, support the critical research agenda through the grant giving machinery) above conceptual precision and hypothesis testing. In the process, critical thinking problematically imports the paranoid outer reaches of the blogosphere into academia, thus legitimizing the conspiracies of hidden-hands, sinister schemes, malign forces, secret agendas, and controlling systems of power purveyed on websites like Spinwatch and Neocon Europe. In this context, Dixit and Stump's proposal to advance critical inquiry by “de-naturalizing the state” is less than helpful, not least because it merely reinforces the obsessive suspicion of the state that defines critical terrorology's worldview. In particular, Dixit and Stump's suggestion is based on the reductionist claim by Weldes, Laffey, Gusterson and Duvall that the whole field of “security studies” (an ill-defined subject area at the best of times) is predicated on immutable state threats. Consequently: Actors and their insecurities are naturalized in the sense that they are treated as facts that, because they are given by the nature of the interstate system, can be taken for granted. Taken as natural facts, states and other organized actors become the foundational objects the taken-for-granted of which serves to ground security studies.3 The proposed “de-naturalizing” of the state rests on this flimsy criticism of security studies, which raises more questions than it answers. What, we might ask, does “de-naturalizing” the state really mean? Taken to its logical conclusion it implies that we cannot discuss states as social facts. Nor can a de-naturalized perspective accept that the international system is primarily composed of states that express themselves through collective identities and interests and give material form to these through institutions and symbols that range from flags and anthems to national airlines and armed forces. From the constructivist ontology that Dixit and Stump embrace it appears that because there are no social facts that are not socially constituted there can be no such thing as facts at all. But if states cannot at a minimum be construed as social facts with histories and interests then how, we might wonder, can we begin to study their actions? In their subsequent discussion of terrorism as practice, the world Dixit and Stump inhabit is comprised purely of discourses and practices. Even a state's terror strategy, from this perspective, erroneously assumes an “objectively existing phenomenon.”4 Extending the process of de-naturalization, moreover, leads to some bizarre and nihilistic conclusions. The logic of constructivism would entail “de-naturalizing” not just the state, but all social arrangements, and any human organization, from nationalities, governments, and sub-state actors, to universities, academic journals, language and the constitution of the self itself. Ultimately, such “de-naturalization” undermines the foundations of social inquiry. All human institutions, from the state downwards, rest on assumptions and practices that are socially and historically constituted. All institutions and social structures can therefore be deconstructed.5 Fundamentally, there is nothing particularly novel about this insight that in fact began with the ancient Greek distinction between nomos and physis.6 Yet, if a program of inquiry simply regards constitutive processes as the only thing worth studying, then all phenomena collapse back into language, which robs everything, including constructivism itself, of meaning. As the Australian philosopher John Anderson observed of this style of thinking, it functions “as a substitute at once for philosophy and for a real theory of language.”7 The point is, as we argued in our review, that to achieve a genuine understanding we must either investigate the facts that are talked about or study the fact that they are talked about in a certain way. If we concentrate on the uses of language we are in danger of taking our discoveries about manners of speaking as answers to questions about what is there. This path leads not to any meaningful insight, but to the paradoxes of idealism Jorge Luis Borges explored in his Ficciones. In Borges's short story “Tln, Uqbar, Orbis Tertius,” the metaphysicians of the imaginary world of Tln (or the world conceived by constructivism) do not seek “for the truth, or even for verisimilitude,”8 which they consider devoid of interest, but instead pursue a “kind of amazement.”9 For, ultimately, if human agents are themselves, as Dale Copeland notes, merely “puppets of the ideational system in which they find themselves” then “each would exist as a socially conditioned 'Me', without the free-willed 'I' capable of resisting the socialization process.”10 Such a condition of linguistic mutability, in fact, undermines any transformative possibility for the international system, or indeed anything else. Yet, ironically, this is the very thing constructivists and critical theorists want to show is possible. Furthermore, if Dixit and Stump do not accept the logic of their constructivism, which abandons academic engagement for the path of Tlnist astonishment, then they must assert, somewhat arbitrarily, that we should de-naturalize the state, yet leave all other social institutions in their “natural” state. Such a method only **frames the debate in a way that favors a set of ideological preferences**, which inevitably prejudices the outcome of any inquiry by determining that all problems are the fault of the state and its insidious systems of exclusion. Dixit and Stump's proposed de-naturalization of the state, therefore, fails any adequate standard of hypothesis testing. Put simply, you cannot “de-naturalize” the one thing you might object to in the current political system, but leave all other practices and social arrangements, including the constitutive positions you occupy, naturalized as if you existed in Olympian detachment. As we pointed out in our review, at best this position is intellectually incoherent, and at worst hypocritical. We exemplified this point in our initial review with reference to Ken Booth's contradictory assertion that critical theorists must recognize that they inhabit a world constituted by powerful ideological systems, yet must themselves “stand outside” those systems.11 Such schemes repeat the Marxian fallacy of false consciousness, asserting that everyone, apart from the critically initiated, has their understanding distorted by the ideology in dominance. Critical theory apparently endows its disciples with the unique capacity to “stand outside” these systems of dominance and see through the othering processes of the state. Meanwhile, those trapped in the quotidian reality of the state have no access to this higher insight. Booth's article in Critical Studies on Terrorism shows where this style of thinking leads: to the conviction that the followers of critical theory alone can transcend the mundane and the political.

#### Framing in terms of state security interests is key to change policy

Sudha Setty 12, Professor of Law at Western New England University School of Law, “National Security Interest Convergence,” Harvard National Security Journal Vol 4, http://harvardnsj.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Vol.4-Setty-FINAL.pdf

The same may be said for politicians in the post - 9/11 context. Rights - protective arguments that were once championed by Democrats in Congress — for example, curtailing warrantless surveillance by the government, complying with international law obligations regarding the detention and trial of terrorism suspects, and reforming the laws governing removal of immigrants — have fallen prey to the phenomenon that Bell observed: There is simply not enough political will to support these objectives to meaningfully alter national security laws or policies. However, framing those initiatives in a way that speaks to mainstream constituencies is the next - best option.¶ The following Subsections lay out areas in which rights - protective legislation can gain political traction by reframing initiatives in terms that will appeal to more legislators and their major constituencies.¶ 1. Foreign policy ¶ Effective foreign policy depends on the ability of the United States to maintain its soft power, which in turn depends on maintaining the respect of other nations and preserving the willingness of our allies to cooperate with us on policy and security matters. That respect and willingness is most forthcoming when the United States acts as a vanguard in protecting the rights of the politically powerless. The perception that U.S. soft power in foreign relations or U.S. counterterrorism and intelligence efforts might be jeopardized could — as it did in Bell’s original thesis — serve as a persuasive means of garnering support for rights protective measures.¶ Thus, there are two important facets to the relationship between foreign policy and rights - protective interest convergence. First, the U.S. government has made it an imperative to win over the support and loyalty of allied nations who are skeptical of U.S. antiterrorism efforts that previously have been dismissive of the countries’ own priorities and cultural norms. 93 This, in many respects, reflects the most natural application of Bell’s interest convergence theory, which addressed the interests of the U.S. political elites in the context of the Cold War. The Brown v. Board of Education decision helped market the United States as a post-World War II moral authority, responsive to the concerns of emerging democracies and to the growing international focus on human rights treaties and protocols.94 In the post-September 11 context, government responses to concerns that the United States has flouted its own human rights standards,95 disregarded the rule of law,96 and lacked sensitivity to Muslims around the world,97 have served not only moral interests, but realpolitik interests as well. In this respect, the framing of rights protection as a foreign policy matter has occurred on occasion, but has not been consistent.

#### Self-fulfilling prophecy is backwards

Joanna Macy 95, general systems scholar and deep ecologist, Ecopsychology

There is also the superstition that negative thoughts are self-fulfilling. This is of a piece with the notion, popular in New Age circles, that we create our own reality I have had people tell me that “to speak of catastrophe will just make it more likely to happen.” Actually, the contrary is nearer to the truth. Psychoanalytic theory and personal experience show us that it is precisely what we repress that eludes our conscious control and tends to erupt into behavior. As Carl Jung observed, “When an inner situation is not made conscious, it happens outside as fate.” But ironically, in our current situation, the person who gives warning of a likely ecological holocaust is often made to feel guilty of contributing to that very fate.

**No global war impact---waged because of LACK OF SECURITY goals, not because of them**

David **Chandler 9**, Professor of International Relations at the Department of Politics and International Relations, University of Westminster, War Without End(s): Grounding the Discourse of `Global War', Security Dialogue 2009; 40; 243

Western governments appear to portray some of the distinctive characteristics that Schmitt attributed to ‘motorized partisans’, in that the shift from narrowly strategic concepts of security to more abstract concerns reflects the fact that Western states have tended to fight free-floating and non-strategic wars of aggression without real enemies at the same time as professing to have the highest values and the absolute enmity that accompanies these. The government policy documents and critical frameworks of ‘global war’ have been so accepted that it is assumed that it is the strategic interests of Western actors that lie behind the often irrational policy responses, with ‘global war’ thereby being understood as merely the extension of instrumental struggles for control. This perspective seems unable to contemplate the possibility that it is the lack of a strategic desire for control that drives and defines ‘global’ war today. ¶ Very few studies of the ‘war on terror’ start from a study of the Western actors themselves rather than from their declarations of intent with regard to the international sphere itself. This methodological framing inevitably makes assumptions about strategic interactions and grounded interests of domestic or international regulation and control, which are then revealed to explain the proliferation of enemies and the abstract and metaphysical discourse of the ‘war on terror’ (Chandler, 2009a). For its radical critics, the abstract, global discourse merely reveals the global intent of the hegemonizing designs of biopower or neoliberal empire, as critiques of liberal projections of power are ‘scaled up’ from the international to the global.¶ Radical critics working within a broadly Foucauldian problematic have no problem grounding global war in the needs of neoliberal or biopolitical governance or US hegemonic designs. These critics have produced numerous frameworks, which seek to assert that global war is somehow inevitable, based on their view of the needs of late capitalism, late modernity, neoliberalism or biopolitical frameworks of rule or domination. From the declarations of global war and practices of military intervention, rationality, instrumentality and strategic interests are read in a variety of ways (Chandler, 2007). Global war is taken very much on its own terms, with the declarations of Western governments explaining and giving power to radical abstract theories of the global power and regulatory might of the new global order of domination, hegemony or empire¶ The alternative reading of ‘global war’ rendered here seeks to clarify that the declarations of global war are a sign of the lack of political stakes and strategic structuring of the international sphere rather than frameworks for asserting global domination. We increasingly see Western diplomatic and military interventions presented as justified on the basis of value-based declarations, rather than in traditional terms of interest-based outcomes. This was as apparent in the wars of humanitarian intervention in Bosnia, Somalia and Kosovo – where there was no clarity of objectives and therefore little possibility of strategic planning in terms of the military intervention or the post-conflict political outcomes – as it is in the ‘war on terror’ campaigns, still ongoing, in Afghanistan and Iraq. ¶ There would appear to be a direct relationship between the lack of strategic clarity shaping and structuring interventions and the lack of political stakes involved in their outcome. In fact, the globalization of security discourses seems to reflect the lack of political stakes rather than the urgency of the security threat or of the intervention. Since the end of the Cold War, the central problematic could well be grasped as one of withdrawal and the emptying of contestation from the international sphere rather than as intervention and the contestation for control. The disengagement of the USA and Russia from sub-Saharan Africa and the Balkans forms the backdrop to the policy debates about sharing responsibility for stability and the management of failed or failing states (see, for example, Deng et al., 1996). It is the lack of political stakes in the international sphere that has meant that the latter has become more open to ad hoc and arbitrary interventions as states and international institutions use the lack of strategic imperatives to construct their own meaning through intervention. As Zaki Laïdi (1998: 95) explains:¶ war is not waged necessarily to achieve predefined objectives, and it is in waging war that the motivation needed to continue it is found. In these cases – of which there are very many – war is no longer a continuation of politics by other means, as in Clausewitz’s classic model – but sometimes the initial expression of forms of activity or organization in search of meaning. . . . War becomes not the ultimate means to achieve an objective, but the most ‘efficient’ way of finding one. ¶ The lack of political stakes in the international sphere would appear to be the precondition for the globalization of security discourses and the ad hoc and often arbitrary decisions to go to ‘war’. In this sense, global wars reflect the fact that the international sphere has been reduced to little more than a vanity mirror for globalized actors who are freed from strategic necessities and whose concerns are no longer structured in the form of political struggles against ‘real enemies’. The mainstream critical approaches to global wars, with their heavy reliance on recycling the work of Foucault, Schmitt and Agamben, appear to invert this reality, portraying the use of military firepower and the implosion of international law as a product of the high stakes involved in global struggle, rather than the lack of clear contestation involving the strategic accommodation of diverse powers and interests.

#### Threat con isn’t sufficient to cause war

Stuart J Kaufman 9, Prof Poli Sci and IR – U Delaware, “Narratives and Symbols in Violent Mobilization: The Palestinian-Israeli Case,” *Security Studies* 18:3, p. 433

Even when hostile narratives, group fears, and opportunity are strongly present, war occurs only if these factors are harnessed. Ethnic narratives and fears must combine to create significant ethnic hostility among mass publics. Politicians must also seize the opportunity to manipulate that hostility, evoking hostile narratives and symbols to gain or hold power by riding a wave of chauvinist mobilization. Such mobilization is often spurred by prominent events (for example, episodes of violence) that increase feelings of hostility and make chauvinist appeals seem timely. If the other group also mobilizes and if each side’s felt security needs threaten the security of the other side, the result is a security dilemma spiral of rising fear, hostility, and mutual threat that results in violence.¶ A virtue of this symbolist theory is that symbolist logic explains why ethnic peace is more common than ethnonationalist war. Even if hostile narratives, fears, and opportunity exist, severe violence usually can still be avoided if ethnic elites skillfully define group needs in moderate ways and collaborate across group lines to prevent violence: this is consociationalism.17 War is likely only if hostile narratives, fears, and opportunity spur hostile attitudes, chauvinist mobilization, and a security dilemma.

#### Their K of democracy is wrong---this card trashes them---all their args will become offense for us

Joel A. Johnson 7 is Assistant Professor in the Department of Government and International Affairs at Augustana College Beyond Practical Virtue: A Defense of Liberal Democracy Through Literature \*gender modified ( )

LIBERAL DEMOCRACY brashly eliminates the supposed elevating influences of aristocracy, theocracy, clerisy, and other formal hierarchies. However, it more than makes up the deficit by supplying a number of elevating forces indirectly. Liberal democracy places people in an unmediated, strenuous relationship with their environment, and the resultant challenges call forth a wider range of excellences than hierarchical relationships do.¶ The problem is that in their struggle for autonomy, people tend to cultivate those virtues that best enhance control over their environment—thus the emphasis on frugality, industry, ingenuity, and the like. Were this the endpoint of democratic development, we would either have to reject liberal democracy, as the aesthetic critics do, or defend it as the lesser of two evils: that is, as being seriously defective but nonetheless choiceworthy. Which alternative we choose depends on our relative valuation of peace, prosperity, and justice on the one hand, and nobility of character on the other. Given the disadvantages of aristocracy and the dangers of excessive state power, I (like most Americans) would probably stick with democracy, and hope for the best. There would be something deeply demoralizing about having to sacrifice the sort of full excellence the critics extol, but the alternative is far more disagreeable.¶ However, democratic development does not end with practical virtue. As I demonstrated in Chapter 3, the democratic struggle with nature and necessity, because a difficult one, causes people to take great pride in their achievement of autonomy. We inwardly celebrate our victories, and exhibit arrogance toward the obstacles we have overcome (recall Billy Kirby and his chopped trees). Though hardly desirable in its own right, this arrogance implies a second, more laudable attitude: a grudging appreciation of our opponent’s worth. We tend to be arrogant regarding those accomplishments in which we take pride. No adult, for example, will boast of defeating a child at chess. Unless the contest is a challenging one, with a significant possibility of our losing, we have no reason to feel self-satisfied. The actions we do take pride in (winning a close game, catching a big fish, raising a child, improving our community) are generally those that involve a substantial struggle and an uncertain outcome.¶ The opposing team, the trophy bass, the challenges of parenthood, even one’s political rivals (provided they are not devious or willfully evil) come to have a greater significance precisely because they have put us to the test. It is because they were worthy opponents that we can be proud of our victories. The team we have defeated is no longer just a collection of people in uniforms, toward whom we have no particular aversion or attraction. They have become noble rivals who pushed us to excel—and, given different circumstances or greater luck, could have beaten us.¶ Implicit in our arrogance is a recognition of the nobility of the people or things against which we have struggled. The world becomes, in our view, more than something to master. Our arrogant materialism provides the groundwork and motivating force for a more enlightened appreciation of the world and its inhabitants. In fact, the appreciation we feel is deeper and broader than what aristocrats feel, since it pervades almost every aspect of our lives.¶ Incidentally, Charles Dickens misses this in his portrayal of Josiah Bounderby, a self-made man who continually boasts of his rise from poverty. Dickens takes the easy path in Hard Times by revealing Bounderby as a fraud. The book would have been far more interesting had he allowed Bounderby to be a genuine, truthful character. If we were to examine Bounderby’s pride more closely (and free it from the distortions of caricature), we would likely find it deriving from a real appreciation of the challenges he faced as a child, and a desire to gain recognition for his achievements. Bounderby has romanticized his own struggle for autonomy, the conditions of his poverty, and the meaning of his success, which demonstrates that there is something in him—and others like him—that Dick- ens fails to notice. There is something noble about Bounderby’s rise from the gutter, though it is hidden by the arrogant materialism Dickens ridicules. Like most successful people, Bounderby is capable of further development— and in fact contains within himself the basic sentiments necessary to drive such development. Compared to Dickens, Howells is far more attentive to the complexities of the self-made person’s motivations in his analysis of Silas Lapham and Jacob Dryfoos.¶ Were we to stop here, we would still have failed to provide an adequate answer to the critics. Our struggle for autonomy may give us a deeper appreciation of the world, but our arrogant materialism still overshadows that appreciation. Unless we can find a way to encourage the desirable but underlying sentiments, while keeping our dominant materialist impulses in check, our justification of liberal democracy will be mere talk about potentialities. Fortunately, healthy liberal democracy provides a remedy for the problem of narrowly developed people: the public sphere. Constructed on the basis of equality and liberty, the democratic public sphere compels us to explain ourselves to others, listen to responses with respect, and gradually assimilate new ideas with our existing ones. Our hard edges become softened, our nobler sentiments become confirmed, and we slowly become better developed as a whole. We may not all become spectacularly well developed (this is an impossible dream), but most people will be improved by this process of liberation, struggle, and refinement.¶ Have I fully answered the critics? Probably not. It would be impossible to satisfy all of them completely, given their own differences of opinion. What unites them, however, is a conviction that under conditions of equal liberty, citizens will invariably tend toward mediocrity, conformity, and petty materialism. Granting negative liberty to people will simply give them greater opportunity for choosing poorly. Given this scenario, would it not be better to give additional political power to those who can make good use of liberty, and entrust everyone else to their care and guidance? I believe I have made a strong case against this general argument. Though the sort of individual development possible within liberal democracy may be at odds with some of the critics’ ideals, it is nonetheless vastly preferable to the petty materialism the critics rightly despise. It does not sacrifice nobility, and it has the added advantage of being democratic. Nearly all dem-ocratic citizens are exposed to the indirect elevating effects that equal liberty creates, and subsequently can undergo significant amounts of development.¶ The gain to humanity of having a democratic ideal of individual development far outweighs any sacrifice of spectacular excellence we might have to make. So even if the critics will not be fully satisfied, chances are they will be mollified. Democracy, if properly understood and properly ordered, is hardly the threat to world civilization the critics make it out to be. In addition, it is not clear that this conception of individual development precludes the cultivation of genius. Genius tends to spring up without regard for the form of political institutions, and can flourish without aristocratic patronage.¶ At the same time, my argument provides the beginnings of a response to those critics on the Left who would question my reluctance to advocate more-revolutionary action. After all, if conditions of liberty and equality prompt fuller individual development, why not eliminate all the factors that distort one’s character, such as private property and the capitalist relationship to labor? My initial reply is that liberal democracy is fertile enough ground for individual development, and we can achieve a reasonably high level of culture without resorting to revolution. When one considers the tangible and intangible costs of communist revolution—costs that make communism not only difficult to achieve but perhaps even undesirable as an end—it is comforting to know that a more moderate regime can provide much of the same type of development that Marx envisioned in his utopia. Liberal democrats will probably never transform themselves completely into species beings, but they are capable of transcending and likely will transcend the narrowness of soul that both Marx and the aesthetic critics despised.¶ A further concern with communist revolution is that Marx is rather ambiguous about what motivates communists to engage in meaningful activities. To his credit, Marx points out that it is in our nature—our genuine nature—to seek to produce beautiful things, but he neither fully appreciates how our creative spirit depends on a close engagement with the world around us nor satisfactorily explains how the structure of communism encourages this interaction. By removing the element of individualist struggle from the human experience, he eliminates the most powerful incentive toward developing one’s faculties. Relying on the remaining incentive— our spontaneous creative impulses—seems overly optimistic in the face of the aesthetic critique. Even the aristocratic critics realize the necessity of prodding people to do more than follow their momentary whims (recall James Fitzjames Stephen’s quip about the marsh water not running to the sea). Given the violence and injustice necessary to achieve the communist ideal, and the uncertainty of individual development within communist society, there is little reason to abandon liberal democracy for it.1

#### Rejection of national interest eradicates the very notion of value making total violence inevitable.

**Gelven ’94** (Michael, Prof. Phil. – Northern Illinois U., “War and Existence: A Philosophical Inquiry”, p. 268-269)

1. The concept that the only acceptable behavior among nations is a total and continuous peace, that such an unbroken peace is the supreme desideratum, is fatal. For a commitment to a complete and total peace means that at no time can any nation assert its own interests or values to maintain itself as an autonomous nation. The counterargument, that a nation might sacrifice its uniqueness or autonomy for the sake of a world peace, is to misunderstand what peace means. True peace is possible only if the we-they principle is respected. Furthermore, the idea that no nation can struggle for its own authenticity or independence, because such uses of military power manifest a step away from peace, is simply bad thinking. It does not seem to me that a small nation going to war in order to achieve some semblance of respect for its own values necessarily entails an all-out nuclear holocaust. Perhaps such small struggles throughout the world are actually beneficial, for they keep the world political body alive with change and with openings for hope. Indeed, even the idea of the superpowers involved with certain wars for their own interests is not necessarily an antipeace event, since peace depends on the authenticity of one's own. It is far more likely that an actual nuclear confrontation with the two superpowers will happen if no wars are fought on the level of "conventional" weaponry. **Mankind does not function well in the greenhouse of abstraction**. 2. The disjunction assumed by some who perceive this question simplistically is that one must always assume that there are only two choices: nuclear confrontation or submission. This notion must be resisted at all costs. Surely no simplistic idea is more deadly than this, because in the last analysis it tends to make any notion of sympathy for what is one's own an impediment to peace. But peace can be achieved only when the sense of what is one's own continues to matter, and to matter greatly. Indeed, the concept that one must see this problem in terms of the dreadful decision between submission and nuclear madness should be replaced with an understanding of what it means to be a state at all. We must recognize two things: retention of our own values is an absolute commitment, but avoidance of a nuclear holocaust is also an absolute value. By these principles the two values are conjoined rather than disjoined. 3. Contained wars, whether nonnuclear or even using nuclear weapons on a limited basis, should not be seen as an absolute evil. Those of us who care very much about avoiding a nuclear confrontation are simply different from those who merely lament the possibility with a wringing of hands. To forgo those values is to submit to the nihilistic point of view that the nuclear weapons confront us with only two alternatives. We must remain human beings, and we must retain patriotism in order for there to be peace. But peace entails the willingness to defend oneself against tyranny; otherwise peace comes to be identified with capitulation. A Carthaginian peace is not the only kind of peace possible; it is indeed only an embryonic notion of peace. 4. The slogan "Peace at any price," therefore, represents the greatest promise of a nuclear war: first, because it promotes an opportunity for blackmail and would-be aggressors, but second, and more important, because it sponsors an atmosphere and a way of thinking that undermines the very meaning of peace itself, respect between nations. To urge capitulation rather than warfare when basic institutions are threatened is to deny the very meaning of peace, since peace can occur only when there are autonomous nations. Such pacifistic thinking also creates a totally false view of what it means to be a human being, for it sets up as the supreme value the continued existence of individual lives only, denying the truth that we are not isolated beings without institutional meaning. 5. Therefore, the great question of our day is not the question of peace or war, but rather the avoidance of a nuclear holocaust as well as a nihilistic capitulation. By recognizing the true meanings of war and peace, the proper misunderstanding of this profound truth can be realized. To forget these fundamental meanings invites both **nihilism and nuclear war.**

#### Prefer our impacts – multiple studies confirm that people are more likely to underestimate the risk of extinction scenarios because they’ve never happened – we actually have a cognitive bias in favor of systemic impacts

Eliezer Yudkowsky, Research Fellow at the Singularity Institute for Artificial Intelligence, 8-31-2006 "Cognitive biases potentially affecting judgment of global risks" http://singinst.org/upload/cognitive-biases.pdf

Biases implicit in the availability heuristic affect estimates of risk. A pioneering study by Lichtenstein et. al. (1978) examined absolute and relative probability judgments of risk. People know in general terms which risks cause large numbers of deaths and which cause few deaths. However, asked to quantify risks more precisely, people severely overestimate the frequency of rare causes of death, and severely underestimate the frequency of common causes of death. Other repeated errors were also apparent: Accidents were judged to cause as many deaths as disease. (Diseases cause about 16 times as many deaths as accidents.) Homicide was incorrectly judged a more frequent cause of death than diabetes, or stomach cancer. A followup study by Combs and Slovic (1979) tallied reporting of deaths in two newspapers, and found that errors in probability judgments correlated strongly (.85 and .89) with selective reporting in newspapers. People refuse to buy flood insurance even when it is heavily subsidized and priced far below an actuarially fair value. Kates (1962) suggests underreaction to threats of flooding may arise from "the inability of individuals to conceptualize floods that have never occurred... Men on flood plains appear to be very much prisoners of their experience... Recently experienced floods appear to set an upward bound to the size of loss with which managers believe they ought to be concerned." Burton et. al. (1978) report that when dams and levees are built, they reduce the frequency of floods, and thus apparently create a false sense of security, leading to reduced precautions. While building dams decreases the frequency of floods, damage per flood is so much greater afterward that the average yearly damage increases. It seems that people do not extrapolate from experienced small hazards to a possibility of large risks; rather, the past experience of small hazards sets a perceived upper bound on risks. A society well-protected against minor hazards will take no action against major risks (building on flood plains once the regular minor floods are eliminated). A society subject to regular minor hazards will treat those minor hazards as an upper bound on the size of the risks (guarding against regular minor floods but not occasional major floods). Risks of human extinction may tend to be underestimated since, obviously, humanity has never yet encountered an extinction event.

#### The retreat from empiricism ensures that the alternative languishes in an abstract world of irrelevance, helpless to engage decisionmaking discourses—if you subject their internal link and impact arguments to rigorous empirical scrutiny, they fall apart—demonstrates that voting negative both invites great power war and consigns us to political helplessness

David Patrick Houghton 8, **Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Central Florida**, Positivism ‘vs’ Postmodernism: Does Epistemology Make a Difference?, International Politics (2008) 45, 115–128

As long ago as 1981, Yale Ferguson and Richard Mansbach effectively laid the influence of the dogmatic behaviouralism of the 1960s to rest in their book The Elusive Quest, signaling the profound disillusionment of mainstream IR with the idea that a cumulative science of IR would ever be possible (Ferguson and Mansbach, 1988). The popularity of the ‘naïve’ form of positivism, wed to a view of inexorable scientific progress and supposedly practiced by wide-eyed scholars during the 1960s, has long been a thing of the past. Postmodernists hence do the discipline a disservice when they continue to attack the overly optimistic and dogmatic form of positivism as if it still represented a dominant orthodoxy, which must somehow be overthrown. Equally, supporters of the contemporary or ‘neo-’ version of positivism perform a similar disservice when they fail to articulate their epistemological assumptions clearly or at all. Indeed, the first error is greatly encouraged by the second, since by failing to state what they stand for, neo-positivists have allowed postmodernists to fashion a series of straw men who burn rapidly at the slightest touch. Articulating a full list of these assumptions lies beyond the scope of this article, but contemporary neo-positivists are, I would suggest, committed to the following five assumptions, none of which are especially radical or hard to defend: (1) That explaining the social and political world ought to be our central objective, (2) That — subjective though our perceptions of the world may be — many features of the political world are at least potentially explainable. What remains is a conviction that there are at least some empirical propositions, which can be demonstrably shown to be ‘true’ or ‘false’, some underlying regularities that clearly give shape to IR (such as the proposition that democracies do not fight one another), (3) That careful use of appropriate methodological techniques **can establish what patterns exist in the political world**, (4) That positive and normative questions, though related, are ultimately separable, although both constitute valid and interesting forms of enquiry. There is also a general conviction (5) that careful use of research design may help researchers avoid logical pitfalls in their work. Doubtless, there are some who would not wish to use the term ‘positivism’ as an umbrella term for these five assumptions, in which case we probably require a new term to cover them. But to the extent that there exists an ‘orthodoxy’ in the field of IR today, this is surely it.

Writing in 1989, Thomas Biersteker noted that ‘the vast majority of scholarship in international relations (and the social sciences for that matter) proceeds without conscious reflection on its philosophical bases or premises. In professional meetings, lectures, seminars and the design of curricula, we do not often engage in serious reflection on the philosophical bases or implications of our activity. Too often, consideration of these core issues is reserved for (and largely forgotten after) the introductory weeks of required concepts and methods courses, as we socialize students into the profession’ (Biersteker, 1989). This observation — while accurate at the time — would surely be deemed incorrect were it to be made today. Even some scholars who profess regret at the philosophically self-regarding nature of contemporary of IR theory, nevertheless feel compelled to devote huge chunks of their work to epistemological issues before getting to more substantive matters (see for instance Wendt, 1999). The recent emphasis on epistemology has helped to push IR as a discipline further and further away from the concerns of those who actually practice IR. The consequent decline in the policy relevance of what we do, and our retreat into philosophical self-doubt, is ironic given the roots of the field in very practical political concerns (most notably, how to avoid war). What I am suggesting is not that IR scholars should ignore philosophical questions, or that such ‘navel gazing’ is always unproductive, for questions of epistemology surely undergird every vision of IR that ever existed. Rather, I would suggest that the existing debate is sterile and unproductive in the sense that the various schools of thought have much more in common than they suppose; stated more specifically, postpositivists have much more in common than they would like to think with the positivists they seek to condemn. Consequently, to the extent that there is a meaningful dialogue going on with regard to epistemological questions, it has no real impact on what we do as scholars when we look at the world ‘out there’. Rather than focusing on epistemology, it is inevitably going to be more fruitful to subject the substantive claims made by positivists (of all metatheoretical stripes) and postpositivists to the cold light of day. My own view, as the reader may have gathered already, is that the empirical claims of scholars like Der Derian and Campbell will not often stand up to such harsh scrutiny given the inattention to careful evidence gathering betrayed by both, but this is a side issue here; the point is that substantive theoretical and empirical claims, rather than metatheoretical or epistemological ones, ought to be what divides the international relations scene today.