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### 1NC

#### The 1AC’s race-centric approach to liberation is an anti-dentificaiton with the oppressive structures they criticize. They don’t tell you what they are, they tell you what they’re not – this dooms their strategy to failure.

Muñoz 99 (José Estabon, Professor of Performance arts at NYU, Disidentifications: Queers of Color and the Performance of Politics, p. 11-2, )IAA

The theory of **disidentification** that I am offering **is meant to contribute to an understanding of the ways in which queers of color identify with** ethnos or **queerness despite the phobic charges in both fields**. The French linguist Michel Pecheux extrapolated a theory of disidentification from Marxist theorist Louis Althusser's influential theory of subject formation and interpellation. Althusser's "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses" was among the first articulations of the role of ideology in theorizing subject formation. For Althusser, ideology is an inescapable realm in which subjects are called into being or "hailed," a process he calls interpellation. Ideology is the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence. The location of ideology is always within an apparatus and its practice or practices, such as the state apparatusi2 Pecheux built on this theory by describing the three modes in which a subject is constructed by ideological practices. In this schema, the first mode is understood as "**identification," where a "Good Subject" chooses the path of identification with discursive and ideological forms. "Bad Subjects" resist and attempt to reject the images and identificatory sites offered by dominant ideology and proceed to** rebel, to **"counteridentify" and turn against this symbolic system**. **The danger that Pecheux sees in such an operation would be the counterdetermination that such a system installs, a structure that validates the dominant ideology by reinforcing its dominance through the controlled symmetry of "counterdetermination." Disidentification** is the third mode of dealing with dominant ideology, one that **neither opts to assimilate within such a structure nor strictly opposes it**; rather**, disidentification is a strategy that works on and against dominant ideology**. 13 **Instead of** buckling under the pressures of dominant ideology (identification, **assimilation) or attempting to break free of its inescapable sphere** (counteridentification, utopianism), **this "working on and against" is a strategy that tries to transform a cultural logic from within, always laboring to enact permanent structural change while at the same time valuing the importance of local everyday struggles of resistance**.

#### This turns the case – anti-dentifications still carry with them the violent manifestations of assimilation.

Muñoz 99 (José Estabon, Professor of Performance arts at NYU, Disidentifications: Queers of Color and the Performance of Politics, p. 95)IAA

The toll is one that **subjects who attempt to identify with and assimilate to dominant ideologies pay every day of their lives**. The price of the ticket is this: **to find self within the dominant public sphere, we need to deny self**. **The contradictory subjectivity one is left with is** not just the **fragmentary subjectivity** of some unspecified postmodern condition; it is instead **the story of the minoritarian subject within the majoritarian public sphere**. Fortunately, this story does not end at this difficult point, this juncture of painful contradiction. Sometimes misrecognition can be *tactical.* Identification itself can also be manipulated and worked in ways that promise narratives of self that surpass the limits prescribed by the dominant culture

#### And, self-abnegation is the biggest impact – minorities become no one in the process of assimilation

Foss, Foss, & Griffin, 99 (Karen A. Sonja K., & Cindy L., Feminist Rhetorical Theories, p. 107)

The psychic restlessness imposed by the Borderlands is compounded by the silencing of its inhabitants. Several processes work together to deny or inhibit the voices of those who reside in the Borderlands. **Inhabitants often silence themselves by their own processes of self-abnegation**. The conflicting demands of the Borderlands, combined with **the tendency to internalize** the **conflicts** they produce, **often result in feelings of worthlessness.Anzaldua summarizes** this feeling when she says, "**I have so internalized the borderland conflict that sometimes I feel like one cancels out the other and we are zero, nothing, no one**”.

#### Vote negative to disidentify with the affirmative’s call for the ballot

#### Disidentification is the best response to trauma and systemic violence

Muñoz 99 (José Estabon, Professor of Performance arts at NYU, Disidentifications: Queers of Color and the Performance of Politics, p. 31, )IAA

By "limits" I mean something other than failures. Instead, I want to call attention to some of the material and psychic forces that work against the disidentifying subject. I wish to disarm a *precritical* celebratory aura that might attach itself not \ only to disidentification but also to some of this book's other key words: *hybridity, queerness, migrancy, autoethnography,* and so forth. Let me be clear about one thing: **disidentification is about cultural, material, and psychic survival. It is a response to state and global power apparatuses that employ systems of racial, sexual, and national subjugation. These routinized protocols of subjugation are brutal and painful. Disidentification is about managing and negotiating historical trauma and systemic violence**. I have gone to great lengths to explicate, render, and imagine complicated strategies and tactics that enact minoritarian subjectivity. I have wanted to posit that such **processes of self-actualization come into discourse as a response to ideologies that discriminate against, demean, and attempt to destroy components of subjectivity that do not conform or respond to narratives of universalization and normalization**.

### 1NC

#### The government has a fundamental obligation to fight Islamic totalitarianism no matter the costs—the aff rejects this in favor of altruistic selflessness

Peikoff, 1

(Leonard Peikoff, former professor of philosophy, heir of Ayn Rand and founder of the Ayn Rand Institute. “End States Who Sponsor Terrorism” <http://www.peikoff.com/essays_and_articles/end-states-who-sponsor-terrorism/>) Henge \*Ableist lang. modified

October 2, 2001—Fifty years of increasing American appeasement in the Mideast have led to fifty years of increasing contempt in the Muslim world for the U.S. The climax was September 11, 2001. Fifty years ago, Truman and Eisenhower surrendered the West’s property rights in oil, although that oil rightfully belonged to those in the West whose science, technology, and capital made its discovery and use possible. The first country to nationalize Western oil, in 1951, was Iran. The rest, observing our frightened silence, hurried to grab their piece of the newly available loot. The cause of the U.S. silence was not practical, but philosophical. The Mideast’s dictators were denouncing wealthy egotistical capitalism. They were crying that their poor needed our sacrifice; that oil, like all property, is owned collectively, by virtue of birth; and that they knew their viewpoint was true by means of otherworldly emotion. Our Presidents had no answer. Implicitly, they were ashamed of the Declaration of Independence. They did not dare to answer that Americans, properly, were motivated by the selfish desire to achieve personal happiness in a rich, secular, individualist society. The Muslim countries embodied in an extreme form every idea—selfless duty, anti-materialism, faith or feeling above science, the supremacy of the group—which our universities, our churches, and our own political Establishment had long been upholding as virtue. When two groups, our leadership and theirs, accept the same basic ideas, the most consistent side wins. After property came liberty. “The Muslim fundamentalist movement,” writes Yale historian Lamin Sanneh, “began in 1979 with the Iranian [theocratic] revolution . . .” (New York Times 9/23/01). During his first year as its leader, Ayatollah Khomeini, urging a Jihad against “the Great Satan,” kidnapped 52 U.S. diplomatic personnel and held them hostage; Carter’s reaction was [inaction] fumbling paralysis. About a decade later, Iran topped this evil. Khomeini issued his infamous Fatwa aimed at censoring, even outside his borders, any ideas uncongenial to Muslim sensibility. This was the meaning of his threat to kill British author Rushdie and to destroy his American publisher; their crime was the exercise of their right to express an unpopular intellectual viewpoint. The Fatwa was Iran’s attempt, reaffirmed after Khomeini’s death, to stifle, anywhere in the world, the very process of thought. Bush Sr. looked the other way. After liberty came American life itself. The first killers were the Palestinian hijackers of the late 1960s. But the killing spree which has now shattered our soaring landmarks, our daily routine, and our souls, began in earnest only after the license granted by Carter and Bush Sr. Many nations work to fill our body bags. But Iran, according to a State Department report of 1999, is “the most active state sponsor of terrorism,” training and arming groups from all over the Mideast, including Islamic Jihad, Hamas, and Hezbollah. Nor is Iran’s government now “moderating.” Five months ago, the world’s leading terrorist groups resolved to unite in a holy war against the U.S., which they called “a second Israel”; their meeting was held in Teheran. (Fox News 9/16/01) What has been the U.S. response to the above? In 1996, nineteen U.S. soldiers were killed in their barracks in Saudi Arabia. According to a front-page story in The New York Times (6/21/98): “Evidence suggesting that Iran sponsored the attack has further complicated the investigation, because the United States and Saudi Arabia have recently sought to improve relations with a new, relatively moderate Government in Teheran.” In other words, Clinton evaded Iran’s role because he wanted what he called “a genuine reconciliation.” In public, of course, he continued to vow that he would find and punish the guilty. This inaction of Clinton’s is comparable to his action after bin Laden’s attack on U.S. embassies in East Africa; his action was the gingerly bombing of two meaningless targets. Conservatives are equally responsible for today’s crisis, as Reagan’s record attests. Reagan not only failed to retaliate after 241 U.S. marines in Lebanon were slaughtered; he did worse. Holding that Islamic guerrillas were our ideological allies because of their fight against the atheistic Soviets, he methodically poured money and expertise into Afghanistan. This put the U.S. wholesale into the business of creating terrorists. Most of them regarded fighting the Soviets as only the beginning; our turn soon came. For over a decade, there was another guarantee of American impotence: the notion that a terrorist is alone responsible for his actions, and that each, therefore, must be tried as an individual before a court of law. This viewpoint, thankfully, is fading; most people now understand that terrorists exist only through the sanction and support of a government. We need not prove the identity of any of these creatures, because terrorism is not an issue of personalities. It cannot be stopped by destroying bin Laden and the al-Qaeda army, or even by destroying the destroyers everywhere. If that is all we do, a new army of militants will soon rise up to replace the old one. The behavior of such militants is that of the regimes which make them possible. Their atrocities are not crimes, but acts of war. The proper response, as the public now understands, is a war in self-defense. In the excellent words of Paul Wolfowitz, deputy secretary of defense, we must “end states who sponsor terrorism.” A proper war in self-defense is one fought without self-crippling [limiting] restrictions placed on our commanders in the field. It must be fought with the most effective weapons we possess (a few weeks ago, Rumsfeld refused, correctly, to rule out nuclear weapons). And it must be fought in a manner that secures victory as quickly as possible and with the fewest U.S. casualties, regardless of the countless innocents caught in the line of fire. These innocents suffer and die because of the action of their own government in sponsoring the initiation of force against America. Their fate, therefore, is their government’s moral responsibility. There is no way for our bullets to be aimed only at evil men.

#### Egoism is the root of life’s every value

Bernstein, 8

(Andrew Bernstein, professor of philosophy at Marist College and SUNY Purchase. “Objectivism in One Lesson” pg. 11-13) Henge

Readers of Ayn Rand's novels generally notice how purposeful, proud, and fulfilled her heroes are. These readers often raise the question: How realistic is it for her men and women to be so happy in a world torn by moral and psychological conflict? For example, in the current day, anti-heroes dominate serious literature and film; leading public figures are often guilty of crimes and/or serious moral transgressions; and some men's lives are fraught with psychological problems, including struggles with alcohol and drugs. And yet, in The Fountainhead Howard Roark proceeded purposefully and serenely forward, overcoming daunting obstacles, reaching his goals, gaining everything he desired. Readers wonder: Is this possible in real life? Are human beings capable of achieving such exalted moral stature? Can one live in the same manner as an Ayn Rand hero? To answer this question, let's consider several passages from her novels, scenes that dramatize the ennobled stature of Ayn Rand's heroes, and then proceed to extract from them some explanatory principles. In savoring and analyzing her heroes, it is helpful to remember this: she often pointed out that she became a philosopher as a necessary means of understanding the deeper principles animating her characters. In the first passage, the hero of The Fountainhead, the uncompromising architect, Howard Roark, witnesses the opening of his innovative apartment complex, the Enright House. Roark, who earlier had to close his office and work in a granite quarry because of lack of support for his revolutionary designs, savors his triumph. Hatless, standing at a parapet overlooking the East River in New York City, head thrown back and face uplifted toward the sun, he experiences the joyous pride of his accomplishment. A photographer, there to cover the opening for a local paper, sees Roark. The newsman thinks of something that has long puzzled him: "he had always wondered why the sensations one felt in dreams were so much more intense than anything one could experience in waking reality-why the horror was so total and the ecstasy so complete-and what was the extra quality which could never be recaptured afterward; the quality of what he felt when he walked down a path through tangled green leaves in a dream, in an air full of expectation, of causeless, utter rapture-and when he awakened he could not explain it, it had been just a path through some woods." The photographer thinks of it now because, for the first time, he sees that additional quality in a waking moment sees it in Roark's face uplifted toward his building. l One more scene will provide sufficient information to draw an important conclusion. As Roark's new ideas gradually caught hold, he worked on three major projects simultaneously: the Cord Building-an office tower in midtown Manhattan; the Aquitania Hotel on Central Park South; and the Stoddard Temple- a shrine to the human spirit-far to the north on the bluffs overlooking the Hudson River. His lover, Dominique Francon, posed for the statue for his temple. Roark arrived one night at the Temple's construction site to find the sculptor, Steven Mallory, and Dominique working late. Mallory, who knew nothing of Roark's relationship with Dominique, told the architect that they were not doing well, that Dominique could not quite capture the quality he sought. Dominique got dressed but took no part in the conversation. She stood and gazed at Roark. Suddenly, she threw off her robe and posed naked again. Then Mallory saw what he had struggled to see all day. "He saw her body standing before him straight and tense, her head thrown back ... but now her body was alive, so still that it seemed to tremble, saying what he had wanted to hear: a proud, reverent, enraptured surrender to a vision of her own ... ,,2 There are numerous similar scenes in The Fountainhead and Atlas Shrugged. What they show is that the essence of Ayn Rand's heroes is to burn with passion for values. Howard Roark is ecstatic at the completion of his building. Dominique experiences such reverence for Roark's achievements and character that the mere sight of him fills her with inspiration. In Atlas Shrugged, Dagny Taggart's love for her railroad, and Hank Rearden's for both his steel mills and Dagny herself, illustrate an identical theme. These men and women create deep meaning in their lives, which are then filled with joyous excitement. Further, they recognize that value achievement is a means to an end-their life and happiness. They understand that in order to live well, to flourish, to experience joy and exultation, they must pursue values that will, in fact, lead to these outcomes. In subsequent chapters, we will explore the specific values Ayn Rand held every individual should pursue, the means by which he should pursue them, and the reason such values are objective, i.e., derived fundamentally from facts, from reality, and not from subjective whim. But here, the preliminary point is that a rational man sees something as a value because he understands it improves his wellbeing-it contributes to both the sustenance and the enjoyment of his time on earth. Architecture, for example, is both the means by which Roark productively supports his life-and the most fundamental source of meaning in it. Therefore, the initial questions to be discussed are: What does it mean to actually value something? And, related: What role do personal values play in promoting an individual's happiness? To these questions Ayn Rand'!!\ answer is that values are those things or persons that fill a man's life with significance and purpose, those things that he considers worthy, valuable, important, the things he is willing to work for-to get or to keep. In Ayn Rand's words: '''Value' is that which one acts to gain and/or keep." Perhaps the key term in that definition is "acts." Values are always the object of an action. Whether a man loves education or money or art or a beautiful home or a particular man or woman or children or any and all of the above, his values are those things he considers so important that they impel him to purposeful, goal-directed action. In this regard, values must be carefully distinguished from dreams, wishes, and fantasies·3 For example, if a man states that five million dollars would be an enormous benefit to his life, but takes no practical steps to earn it, the money cannot properly be said to be one of his values; rather, it is no more than a wish or a pleasant fantasy. What it would take to transform this dream into a value would be action. If the individual gets a job and starts to earn money; if he works out a budget and begins to save; if he accepts a second job and saves all of the money he earns from it; if he invests his money and carefully monitors his gains; if he does all of this, then it can truthfully be claimed that wealth is a value to this man. An old saying states that actions speak louder than words, and nowhere is this as true as in the realm of values. Every man can identify his actual values and those of others-by identifying what each individual pursues in action. Ayn Rand's theory is one that proudly upholds personal values and a life filled with the things and persons an individual loves. For example, an individual might esteem an education in computer science, or a career in teaching, or a love relationship with a particular man or woman, or starting a family and rearing children, or one of a hundred other life-affirming goals. Whatever positive values an individual holds, he should indefatigably pursue them. Human beings, Ayn Rand argues, should seek their own happiness. They are not obligated to serve the needs of their family, to offer selfless service to God, or to sacrifice themselves for society. They should not renounce personal values. Rather, they should live and act selfishly. To be self-ish, in Ayn Rand's theory, is to hold and pursue meaningful, life-enhancing values. If a man were to be truly unselfish, and actually attempt to practice a self-sacrifice code, then he would have to renounce his personal values; the more urgent the value(s) he surrendered, the more "noble" his sacrifice would be considered. So, for example, if a young man surrenders the woman he loves to satisfy his mother's expectations, by these standards he is virtuous; if he additionally relinquishes career aspirations, his own apartment, and an independent life to stay home and care for her, the conventional code deems him even more "saintly." But after sacrificing his love, his career, and his autonomy, his life will be empty, drained of personal meaning, filled with only resentment and bitterness.

#### Vote negative as an act of heroism

#### The hero is committed to rational, life-promoting values—the choice is key

Bernstein, 8

(Andrew Bernstein, professor of philosophy at Marist College and SUNY Purchase. “Objectivism in One Lesson” pg. 57-59) Henge

That reason is man's means of survival has profound impact on the life of each individual. Based on this fundamental truth, Ayn Rand looks at man and observes a being who can control his own life and destiny. She does not see a being helplessly buffeted by social forces, as do contemporary Behaviorists and Marxists. She does not see a creature doomed by fate or tragic flaws, as did Sophocles and Shakespeare. Nor does she see a being wracked by repressed urges and torn by inner psychological conflicts, as do Freud and his heirs. She does not observe what other thinkers have claimed to observe. Ayn Rand looks at man and sees the possibility of towering heroism. The main characters of her novels make this abundantly clear. Observe how each is distinctively etched as a variation on a central theme. Howard Roark, for example, is an architectural genius who struggles for years against a conservative society antagonistic to his revolutionary designs. Hank Rearden is a superbly productive industrialist and innovative thinker who develops a new metal alloy-Rearden Metal-that is as superior to steel as steel is to iron. Oagny Taggart is a brilliant engineer who expertly runs a transcontinental railroad, who recognizes the merits of Rearden Metal before anyone else, and who stands against virtually an entire society to rebuild her railroad with the new substance rather than with steel. John Galt is a towering intellect-an exalted scientist, inventor, philosopher, statesman-a man whose accomplishments are so prodigious he could be compared only to such real-life geniuses as Aristotle, Leonardo da Vinci, and Isaac Newton. Ayn Rand's view of man's nature in one word is that he is a thinker. He is a being whose nature requires him to live by his own judgment, to never allow others dominance in his life, to neither conform nor rebel but to use his own mind. This, we have seen, is The Lesson of Objectivism: the mind is man's tool of survival and the deepest core of his nature. But the mind does not function automatically. Man is a being who must choose to be rational. This is what Ayn Rand means when she describes man as "a being of volitional consciousness." He must choose reason, he must choose reality, he must choose to live and function as man. 1 Human beings have free will. On Ayn Rand's distinctive theory, to say men have free will is to claim that they possess the power of choice, the capacity to govern the outcome of their own lives by means of the choices they make and the actions they perform based on them. It is to state that men are in charge of their own destinies, that they can select life-promoting values, enact the cause(s) requisite to achieve them, and thereby attain success and happiness. To a significant degree-despite such uncontrollable factors as physical make-up, the choices of others, and more-men can make their lives turn out the way they want. Put negatively, to possess free will means that there is no external power controlling a man's life, no outside agency necessitating its result. Over the centuries, numerous thinkers, known as determinists, have argued that man is a helpless puppet, controlled by a higher power, be it God or Satan or Fate-or today, in a more scientific era, by his genetic coding, "environmental conditioning" or "socialization." To support free will is to argue that determinism, in any and all of its variants, is false. On Ayn Rand's view. a man can achieve. survive and prosper on earth because his survival instrument is under his direct. volitional. individual control. The most fundamental choice possessed by human beings is: to think or not. Thinking does not occur automatically. It is not like sensory perception. For example, when the wind blows or the sun shines brightly, a man feels it on his skin whether he chooses to or not. Similarly, the noise of a car in the street or a television in the next room is heard involuntarily, with no special act of focus required on an individual's part. But reasoning requires a volitional act, a turning on of the cognitive apparatus, a process of focusing the mind. For example, an entrepreneur does not involuntarily, automatically think about the problems of production his firm faces; he must choose to do so. In any given moment, he is free to evade his responsibilities and turn off the mental switch. Similarly, a college student must voluntarily initiate his research and studying; he must choose to enter the library, open his books and concentrate on their meaning; in any moment, he is able to turn the mind off and let his studies lapse. To think is an act of choice ... Reason does not work automatically; thinking is not a mechanical process; the connections of logic are not made by instinct. The function of your stomach, lungs or heart is automatic; the function of your mind is not. In any hour and issue of your life, you are free to think or to evade that effort. But you are not free to escape from your nature, from the fact that reason is your means of survival-so that for you, who are a human being, the question "to be or not to be" is the question "to think or not to think.,,2 Man, as Ayn Rand explains him, is a being of volitional consciousness. Knowledge of the existence of one's own free will is achieved by direct introspective awareness. An individual can direct his mental attention inward and observe himself in the very act of choosing. The college student, for example, may introspectively watch as he lets his mind wander to daydreams of his girlfriend, but then re-focuses it on his physics textbook. The application of one's mind is under one's own voluntary control-and the processes of powering the mind's attention levels up or down are directly apparent to an individual's examination of his own internal mental states.

### 1NC

#### The aff must defend the instrumental enactment of a policy proposal by the United States federal government

#### “Should” proves that’s most predictable

Ericson, 3

(Jon M., Dean Emeritus of the College of Liberal Arts – California Polytechnic U., et al., The Debater’s Guide, Third Edition, p. 4)

The Proposition of Policy: Urging Future Action In policy propositions, each topic contains certain key elements, although they have slightly different functions from comparable elements of value-oriented propositions. 1. An agent doing the acting ---“The United States” in “The United States should adopt a policy of free trade.” Like the object of evaluation in a proposition of value, the agent is the subject of the sentence. 2. The verb *should*—the first part of a verb phrase that urges action. 3. An action verb to follow *should* in the *should*-verb combination. For example, *should adopt* here **means to put a** program or **policy into action though governmental means**. 4. A specification of directions or a limitation of the action desired. The phrase *free trade*, for example, gives direction and limits to the topic, which would, for example, eliminate consideration of increasing tariffs, discussing diplomatic recognition, or discussing interstate commerce. Propositions of policy deal with future action. Nothing has yet occurred. The entire debate is about whether something ought to occur. What you agree to do, then, when you accept the *affirmative side* in such a debate is to offer sufficient and compelling reasons for an audience to perform the future action that you propose.

#### The 1AC instead discusses a past event, and determines that were it not to have happened, identities would be changed and the world would be different

#### Their failure to do so prevents effective democratic deliberation **by precluding debate over controversial issues—the non-falsifiability of their position destroys profitable argumentation—it’s impossible to repudiate the horrors of genocide**

Steinberg and Freeley, 8
(David L Steinberg is a professor of communication studies – University of Miami, and Austin J Freeley is a criminal, civil rights law, and personal injury attorney., Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making pg.3-4 ) MT

Debate is a means of settling differences, so there must be a difference of opinion or a conflict of interest before there can be a debate. If everyone is in agreement on a fact or value or policy, there is no need for debate; the matter can be settled by unanimous consent. Thus, for example, it would be pointless to attempt to debate “Resolved: That two plus two equals four,” because there is simply no controversy about this statement. Controversy is an essential prerequisite of debate. Where there is no clash of ideas, proposals, interests, or expressed positions on issues, there is no debate. In addition, debate cannot produce effective decisions without clear identification of a question or questions to be answered. For example, general argument may occur about the broad topic of illegal immigration. How many illegal immigrants are in the United States? What is the impact of illegal immigration and immigrants on our economy? What is their impact on our communities? Do they commit crimes? Do they take jobs from American workers? Do they pay taxes? Do they require social services? Is it a problem that some do not speak English? Is it the responsibility of employers to discourage illegal immigration by not hiring undocumented workers? Should they have the opportunity to gain citizenship? Does illegal immigration pose a security threat to our country? Do illegal immigrants do work that American workers are unwilling to do? Are their rights as workers and as human beings at risk due to their status? Are they abused by employers, law enforcement, housing, and businesses? How are their families impacted by their status? What is the moral and philosophical obligation of a nation state to maintain its borders? Should we build a wall on the Mexican border, establish a national identification card, or enforce existing laws against employers? Should we invite immigrants to become U.S. citizens? Surely you can think of many more concerns to be addressed by a conversation about the topic area of illegal immigration. Participation in this “debate” is likely to be emotional and intense. However, it is not likely to be productive or useful without focus on a particular question and identification of a line demarcating sides in the controversy. To be discussed and resolved effectively, controversies must be stated clearly. Vague understanding results in unfocused deliberation and poor decisions, frustration, and emotional distress, as evidenced by the failure of the United States Congress to make progress on the immigration debate during the summer of 2007. Someone disturbed by the problem of a growing underclass of poorly educated, socially disenfranchised youths might observe, “Public schools are doing a terrible job! They are overcrowded, and many teachers are poorly qualified in their subject areas. Even the best teachers can do little more than struggle to maintain order in their classrooms.” That same concerned citizen, facing a complex range of issues, might arrive at an unhelpful decision, such as “We ought to do something about this” or, worse, “It’s too complicated a problem to deal with.” Groups of concerned citizens worried about the state of public education could join together to express their frustrations, anger, disillusionment, and emotions regarding the schools, but without a focus for their discussions, they could easily agree about the sorry state of education without finding points of clarity or potential solutions. A gripe session would follow. But if a precise question is posed—such as “What can be done to improve public education?”—then a more profitable area of discussion is opened up simply by placing a focus on the search for a concrete solution step. One or more judgments can be phrased in the form of debate propositions, motions for parliamentary debate, or bills for legislative assemblies. The statements “Resolved: That the federal government should implement a program of charter schools in at-risk communities” and “Resolved: That the state of Florida should adopt a school voucher program” more clearly identify specific ways of dealing with educational problems in a manageable form, suitable for debate. They provide specific policies to be investigated and aid discussants in identifying points of difference. To have a productive debate, which facilitates effective decision making by directing and placing limits on the decision to be made, the basis for argument should be clearly defined. If we merely talk about “homelessness” or “abortion” or “crime” or “global warming” we are likely to have an interesting discussion but not to establish profitable basis for argument. For example, the statement “Resolved: That the pen is mightier than the sword” is debatable, yet fails to provide much basis for clear argumentation. If we take this statement to mean that the written word is more effective than physical force for some purposes, we can identify a problem area: the comparative effectiveness of writing or physical force for a specific purpose. Although we now have a general subject, we have not yet stated a problem. It is still too broad, too loosely worded to promote well-organized argument. What sort of writing are we concerned with—poems, novels, government documents, website development, advertising, or what? What does “effectiveness” mean in this context? What kind of physical force is being compared—fists, dueling swords, bazookas, nuclear weapons, or what? A more specific question might be, “Would a mutual defense treaty or a visit by our fleet be more effective in assuring Laurania of our support in a certain crisis?” The basis for argument could be phrased in a debate proposition such as “Resolved: That the United States should enter into a mutual defense treaty with Laurania.” Negative advocates might oppose this proposition by arguing that fleet maneuvers would be a better solution. This is not to say that debates should completely avoid creative interpretation of the controversy by advocates, or that good debates cannot occur over competing interpretations of the controversy; in fact, these sorts of debates may be very engaging. The point is that debate is best facilitated by the guidance provided by focus on a particular point of difference, which will be outlined in the following discussion.

#### And, democratic deliberation is the cornerstone of solving all existential global problems**Lundberg 10** [Christian O. Lundberg, Professor of Communications at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, “Tradition of Debate in North Carolina” in Navigating Opportunity: Policy Debate in the 21st Century By Allan D. Louden, p311, Ssanchez]The second major problem with the critique that identifies a naivety in articulating debate and democracy is that it presumes that the primary pedagogical outcome of debate is speech capacities. **But the democratic capacities built by debate are not limited to speech**—as indicated earlier**, debate builds capacity for critical thinking**, analysis of public claims, **informed decision making, and better public judgment**. **If the picture of modem political life that underwrites this critique of debate is a pessimistic view of increasingly labyrinthine and bureaucratic administrative politics, rapid** scientific and technological change outpacing the capacities of the citizenry to comprehend them, **and ever-expanding insular special-interest- and money-driven politics, it is a puzzling solution, at best, to argue thatthese conditions warrant giving up on debate**. If democracy is open to rearticulation, it is open to rearticulation precisely because **as the challenges of modern political life proliferate, the citizenry's capacities can change, which is one of the primary reasons that theorists of democracy** such as Ocwey in The Public awl Its Problems **place such a high premium on education** (Dewey 1988,63, 154). **Debate** provides an indispensible form of education in the modem articulation of democracy because it **builds precisely the skills that allow the citizenry to research and be informed about policy decisions that impact them**, to son rhroueh and evaluate the evidence for and relative merits of arguments for and against a policy in an increasingly infonnation-rich environment, and to prioritize their time and political energies toward policies that matter the most to them. T**he merits of debate as a tool for building democratic capacity-building take on a special significance in the context of information literacy**. John Larkin (2005, HO) argues that one of the primary failings of modern colleges and universities is that they have not changed curriculum to match with the challenges of a new information environment. This is a problem for the course of academic study in our current context, but perhaps more important, argues Larkin, for the future of a citizenry that will need to make evaluative choices against an increasingly complex and multimediatcd information environment (ibid-). Larkin's study tested the benefits of debate participation on information-literacy skills and concluded that in-class debate participants reported significantly higher self-efficacy ratings of their ability to navigate academic search databases and to effectively search and use other Web resources: To analyze the self-report ratings of the instructional and control group students, we first conducted a multivariate analysis of variance on all of the ratings, looking jointly at the effect of instmction/no instruction and debate topic . . . that it did not matter which topic students had been assigned . . . students in the Instnictional [debate) group were significantly more confident in their ability to access information and less likely to feel that they needed help to do so----These findings clearly indicate greater self-efficacy for online searching among students who participated in (debate).... These results constitute strong support for the effectiveness of the project on students' self-efficacy for online searching in the academic databases. There was an unintended effect, however: After doing ... the project, instructional group students also felt more confident than the other students in their ability to get good information from Yahoo and Google. It may be that the library research experience increased self-efficacy for any searching, not just in academic databases. (Larkin 2005, 144) Larkin's study substantiates Thomas Worthcn and Gaylcn Pack's (1992, 3) claim **that debate in the college classroom plays a critical role in fostering the kind of problem-solving skills demanded by the increasingly rich media and information environment of modernity**. Though their essay was written in 1992 on the cusp of the eventual explosion of the Internet as a medium, Worthcn and Pack's framing of the issue was prescient: the primary question facing today's student has changed from how to best research a topic to the crucial question of learning how to best evaluate which arguments to cite and rely upon from an easily accessible and veritable cornucopia of materials. There are, without a doubt, a number of important criticisms of employing debate as a model for democratic deliberation. But cumulatively**, the evidence presented here warrants strong support for expanding debate practice** in the classroom as a **technology for enhancing democratic deliberative capacities**. The unique combination of critical thinking skills, research and information processing skills, oral communication skills, and capacities for listening and thoughtful, open engagement with hotly contested issues argues for debate as a crucial component of a rich and vital democratic life. In-class debate practice both aids students in achieving the best goals of college and university education, **and serves as an unmatched practice for creating thoughtful, engaged, open-minded and self-critical students who are open to the possibilities of meaningful political engagement andnew articulations of democratic life. Expanding this practice is crucial, if only because the more we produce citizens that can actively and effectively engage the political process, the more likely we are to produce revisions of democratic life that are necessary if democracy is not only to survive, but to thrive. Democracy faces a myriad of challenges, including**: domestic and international **issues of class, gender, and racial justice**; wholesale **environmental destruction** and the potential for rapid climate change; emerging threats to international stability in the form of **terrorism, intervention and new possibilities for great power conflict; and increasing challenges of rapid globalization** including an increasingly volatile global economic structure. More than any specific policy or proposal, **an informed and active citizenry that deliberates with greater skill** and sensitivity **provides one of the best hopes for responsive and effective democratic governance, and by extension, one of the last best hopes for dealing with the existential challenges** to democracy [in an] increasingly complex world.

#### **And, absent political simulations we become passive spectators in the world—switch side is key**

Joyner 1999 – Christopher C Joyner Professor of International Law in the Government Department at Georgetown University Spring, 1999 5 ILSA J Int'l & Comp L 377 ILSA Journal of International & Comparative Law

Use of the debate can be an effective pedagogical tool for education in the social sciences. Debates, like other role-playing simulations, help students understand different perspectives on a policy issue by adopting a perspective as their own. But, unlike other simulation games, debates do not require that a student participate directly in order to realize the benefit of the game. Instead of developing policy alternatives and experiencing the consequences of different choices in a traditional role-playing game, debates present the alternatives and consequences in a formal, rhetorical fashion before a judgmental audience. Having the class audience serve as jury helps each student develop a well-thought-out opinion on the issue by providing contrasting facts and views and enabling audience members to pose challenges to each debating team. These debates ask undergraduate students to examine the international legal implications of various United States foreign policy actions. Their chief tasks are to assess the aims of the policy in question, determine their relevance to United States national interests, ascertain what legal principles are involved, and conclude how the United States policy in question squares with relevant principles of international law. Debate questions are formulated as resolutions, along the lines of: "Resolved: The United States should deny most-favored-nation status to China on human rights grounds;" or "Resolved: The United States should resort to military force to ensure inspection of Iraq's possible nuclear, chemical and biological weapons facilities;" or "Resolved: The United States' invasion of Grenada in 1983 was a lawful use of force;" or "Resolved: The United States should kill Saddam Hussein." In addressing both sides of these legal propositions, the student debaters must consult the vast literature of international law, especially the nearly 100 professional law-school-sponsored international law journals now being published in the United States. This literature furnishes an incredibly rich body of legal analysis that often treats topics affecting United States foreign policy, as well as other more esoteric international legal subjects. Although most of these journals are accessible in good law schools, they are largely unknown to the political science community specializing in international relations, much less to the average undergraduate. By assessing the role of international law in United States foreign policy- making, students realize that United States actions do not always measure up to international legal expectations; that at times, international legal strictures get compromised for the sake of perceived national interests, and that concepts and principles of international law, like domestic law, can be interpreted and twisted in order to justify United States policy in various international circumstances. In this way, the debate format gives students the benefits ascribed to simulations and other action learning techniques, in that it makes them become actively engaged with their subjects, and not be mere passive consumers. Rather than spectators, students become legal advocates, observing, reacting to, and structuring political and legal perceptions to fit the merits of their case. The debate exercises carry several specific educational objectives. First, students on each team must work together to refine a cogent argument that compellingly asserts their legal position on a foreign policy issue confronting the United States. In this way, they gain greater insight into the real-world legal dilemmas faced by policy makers. Second, as they work with other members of their team, they realize the complexities of applying and implementing international law, and the difficulty of bridging the gaps between United States policy and international legal principles, either by reworking the former or creatively reinterpreting the latter. Finally, research for the debates forces students to become familiarized with contemporary issues on the United States foreign policy agenda and the role that international law plays in formulating and executing these policies. n8 The debate thus becomes an excellent vehicle for pushing students beyond stale arguments over principles into the real world of policy analysis, political critique, and legal defense.

### Case

#### Evaluate consequences

Jeffrey Isaac, James H. Rudy Professor of Political Science and director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life at Indiana University-Bloomington, Dissent, Vol. 49 No. 2, Spring 2002

As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one's intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. This is why, from the standpoint of politics--as opposed to religion--pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with "good" may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of "good" that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one's goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness. WHAT WOULD IT mean for the American left right now to take seriously the centrality of means in politics? First, it would mean taking seriously the specific means employed by the September 11 attackers--terrorism. There is a tendency in some quarters of the left to assimilate the death and destruction of September 11 to more ordinary (and still deplorable) injustices of the world system--the starvation of children in Africa, or the repression of peasants in Mexico, or the continued occupation of the West Bank and Gaza by Israel. But this assimilation is only possible by ignoring the specific modalities of September 11. It is true that in Mexico, Palestine, and elsewhere, too many innocent people suffer, and that is wrong. It may even be true that the experience of suffering is equally terrible in each case. But neither the Mexican nor the Israeli government has ever hijacked civilian airliners and deliberately flown them into crowded office buildings in the middle of cities where innocent civilians work and live, with the intention of killing thousands of people. Al-Qaeda did precisely this. That does not make the other injustices unimportant. It simply makes them different. It makes the September 11 hijackings distinctive, in their defining and malevolent purpose--to kill people and to create terror and havoc. This was not an ordinary injustice. It was an extraordinary injustice. The premise of terrorism is the sheer superfluousness of human life. This premise is inconsistent with civilized living anywhere. It threatens people of every race and class, every ethnicity and religion. Because it threatens everyone, and threatens values central to any decent conception of a good society, it must be fought. And it must be fought in a way commensurate with its malevolence. Ordinary injustice can be remedied. Terrorism can only be stopped. Second, it would mean frankly acknowledging something well understood, often too eagerly embraced, by the twentieth century Marxist left--that it is often politically necessary to employ morally troubling means in the name of morally valid ends. A just or even a better society can only be realized in and through political practice; in our complex and bloody world, it will sometimes be necessary to respond to barbarous tyrants or criminals, with whom moral suasion won't work. In such situations our choice is not between the wrong that confronts us and our ideal vision of a world beyond wrong. It is between the wrong that confronts us and the means--perhaps the dangerous means--we have to employ in order to oppose it. In such situations there is a danger that "realism" can become a rationale for the Machiavellian worship of power. But equally great is the danger of a righteousness that translates, in effect, into a refusal to act in the face of wrong. What is one to do? Proceed with caution. Avoid casting oneself as the incarnation of pure goodness locked in a Manichean struggle with evil. Be wary of violence. Look for alternative means when they are available, and support the development of such means when they are not. And never sacrifice democratic freedoms and open debate. Above all, ask the hard questions about the situation at hand, the means available, and the likely effectiveness of different strategies. Most striking about the campus left's response to September 11 was its refusal to ask these questions. Its appeals to "international law" were naive. It exaggerated the likely negative consequences of a military response, but failed to consider the consequences of failing to act decisively against terrorism. In the best of all imaginable worlds, it might be possible to defeat al-Qaeda without using force and without dealing with corrupt regimes and political forces like the Northern Alliance. But in this world it is not possible. And this, alas, is the only world that exists. To be politically responsible is to engage this world and to consider the choices that it presents. To refuse to do this is to evade responsibility. Such a stance may indicate a sincere refusal of unsavory choices. But it should never be mistaken for a serious political commitment.

#### Pursuit of heg inevitable—only a question of effectiveness

Tellis ‘9 Ashley J. Tellis, senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace specializing in international security, defense, and Asian strategic issues, Research Director of the Strategic Asia program at the National Bureau of Asian Research, “Preserving Hegemony: The Strategic Tasks Facing the United States,” Global Asia, Vol. 4, No. 1, Spring 2009, <http://globalasia.org/pdf/issue9/Ashley_J._Tellis.pdf>

This hegemony is by no means fated to end any time soon, however, given that the United States remains predominant by most conventional indicators of national power. The character of the United States’ hegemonic behavior in the future will thus remain an issue of concern both within the domestic polity and internationally. Yet the juvenescence of the United States’ “unipolar moment,” combined with the disorientation produced by the September 11 attacks, ought to restrain any premature generalization that the imperial activism begun by the Clinton administration, and which the Bush administration took to its most spirited apotheosis, would in some way come to define the permanent norm of US behavior in the global system. In all probability, it is much more likely that the limitations on US power witnessed in Afghanistan and Iraq will produce a more phlegmatic and accommodating United States over the longer term, despite the fact that the traditional US pursuit of dominance — understood as the quest to maintain a preponderance of power, neutralize threatening challengers, and protect freedom of action, goals that go back to the foundations of the republic — is unlikely to be extinguished any time soon. Precisely because the desire for dominance is likely to remain a permanent feature of US geopolitical ambitions — even though how it is exercised will certainly change in comparison to the Bush years — the central task facing the next administration will still pertain fundamentally to the issue of US power. This concern manifests itself through the triune challenges of: redefining the United States’ role in the world, renewing the foundations of US strength, and recovering the legitimacy of US actions. In other words, the next administration faces the central task of clarifying the character of US hegemony, reinvigorating the material foundations of its power, and securing international support for its policies.

#### Heg key to stability—transition is war

Zhang and Shi 11 [Yuhan, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and Lin Shi, Columbia University, “America’s decline: A harbinger of conflict and rivalry,” [**http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2011/01/22/americas-decline-a-harbinger-of-conflict-and-rivalry**](http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2011/01/22/americas-decline-a-harbinger-of-conflict-and-rivalry), January 22, 2011, SSanchez]

Over the past two decades, no other state has had the ability to seriously challenge the US military. Under these circumstances, motivated by both opportunity and fear, many actors have bandwagoned with US hegemony and accepted a subordinate role. Canada, most of Western Europe, India, Japan, South Korea, Australia, Singapore and the Philippines have all joined the US, creating a status quo that has tended to mute great power conflicts. However, as the hegemony that drew these powers together withers, so will the pulling power behind the US alliance. The result will be an international order where power is more diffuse, American interests and influence can be more readily challenged, and conflicts or wars may be harder to avoid. As history attests, power decline and redistribution result in military confrontation. For example, in the late 19th century America’s emergence as a regional power saw it launch its first overseas war of conquest towards Spain. By the turn of the 20th century, accompanying the increase in US power and waning of British power, the American Navy had begun to challenge the notion that Britain ‘rules the waves.’ Such a notion would eventually see the US attain the status of sole guardians of the Western Hemisphere’s security to become the order-creating Leviathan shaping the international system with democracy and rule of law. Defining this US-centred system are three key characteristics: enforcement of property rights, constraints on the actions of powerful individuals and groups and some degree of equal opportunities for broad segments of society. As a result of such political stability, free markets, liberal trade and flexible financial mechanisms have appeared. And, with this, many countries have sought opportunities to enter this system, proliferating stable and cooperative relations. However, what will happen to these advances as America’s influence declines? Given that America’s authority, although sullied at times, has benefited people across much of Latin America, Central and Eastern Europe, the Balkans, as well as parts of Africa and, quite extensively, Asia, the answer to this question could affect global society in a profoundly detrimental way. Public imagination and academia have anticipated that a post-hegemonic world would return to the problems of the 1930s: regional blocs, trade conflicts and strategic rivalry. Furthermore, multilateral institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank or the WTO might give way to regional organisations. For example, Europe and East Asia would each step forward to fill the vacuum left by Washington’s withering leadership to pursue their own visions of regional political and economic orders. Free markets would become more politicised — and, well, less free — and major powers would compete for supremacy. Additionally, such power plays have historically possessed a zero-sum element. In the late 1960s and 1970s, US economic power declined relative to the rise of the Japanese and Western European economies, with the US dollar also becoming less attractive. And, as American power eroded, so did international regimes (such as the Bretton Woods System in 1973). A world without American hegemony is one where great power wars re-emerge, the liberal international system is supplanted by an authoritarian one, and trade protectionism devolves into restrictive, anti-globalisation barriers. This, at least, is one possibility we can forecast in a future that will inevitably be devoid of unrivalled US primacy.

#### Identities are relational; we live the effects of them as understood by others. Anything else essentializes and staticizes identity

Boys 08 (Jos, Head of Learning and StudentExpierence, Northumbria University, Phd, works with disability groups. “challenging the 'normal': towards new conceptual frameworks” Design. <http://www.sowhatisnormal.co.uk/challenging>. –Veeder)

How then can disability help us re-think about embodiment? Authors such as Samells, Erevelles, Davies and Corker argue, in different ways, that the disabled body/disability/ abnormality continues to be central in its role as a reflective trope/metaphor/ stereotype/figure which ‘shores up’ the categories of the normal/able-bodied, despite its invisibility in most contemporary cultural theory. This occurs through two simultaneous processes. First, the disabled body is perceived as a containable, figurable concept – an unproblematic category in opposition to non-disablement which functions to reproduce particular everyday social and spatial practices as ‘normal’. Second, disability generates enormous anxiety as a ‘problem’ which seems to have in it the potential to be uncontainable/uncontrollable, threatening the ‘normal’ by calling its assumptions into question. the figure of the alien reminds us that what is ‘beyond limit’ is subject to representation: indeed what is beyond representation is, at the same-time, over represented. Ahmed 2000, p2 But Ahmed also argues that to move beyond these stereotypes of able/disabled normal/abnormal we have to move beyond an idea of identity as representation – as almost literally written on the body. Our bodies and their relationships to each other and to objects and spaces are centrally relational practices: each of us through our bodies, lives what Judith Butler calls a performativity that simultaneously re-inscribes and calls into question matters of embodied identity in our everyday practices. We don’t live the essentialist stereotypes of being a Woman, Man, White, Black, Able-bodied or Disabled, we live our relationships to them through a wide range of potential interpretative strategies, both conceptually and through our lived actions.

## 2NC—Objectivism

### Link Stuff

#### Pacifist responses to Islamic extremism inevitably fail and promote Nazism

Root, 1

(Damon Root is a senior editor at Reason magazine. “Against Pacifism” <http://www.atlassociety.org/against-pacifism>) Henge

November 7, 2001 -- In 1941, with Hitler’s war machine furiously hacking Western civilization to bits, George Orwell famously observed that "objectively, the pacifist is pro-Nazi." Today, as Islamic fascists like Osama bin Laden, al-Qaeda, and the Taliban struggle to bring the world under another yoke of vicious, anti-Semitic totalitarianism, our own anti-war activists inform anyone who will listen that "an eye for an eye makes the world go blind." Since these folks would apparently rather see Islamic fascism run free than have America vigorously engage her enemies, let’s consider just what sort of world the modern pacifist is objectively in favor of. Afghanistan, under the Taliban, is literally a hell on earth. Women and girls are deprived of every imaginable civil, social, political, and economic liberty. Their humanity itself is under brutal attack, every minute of every day. According to Human Rights Watch, Taliban officials "beat women on the streets for dress code violations and for venturing outside the home without the company of a close male relative." Amnesty International reports that "women who wear nail varnish could have their fingers chopped off." Forbidden to speak with or visit any male who is not a close relative (including doctors and dentists), women and girls regularly go without basic medical attention. In addition, the Taliban has banned music, films, television, playing cards, and other forms of entertainment. Musical instruments and books have been seized and burned. Civil liberties like freedom of speech and religion are repressed by force; for example, the punishment for converting to Christianity or Judaism, professing these religions, or distributing their literature is death. Amnesty International describes how two men convicted of sodomy "were placed under a wall of dried mud which was bulldozed upon them." In Kabul, an unmarried man convicted of premarital sex received 100 lashes with a leather strap. Had he been married, "the punishment would have been death by stoning," the report states. With each passing day, similar accounts of misogyny and oppression come pouring in. Kim Candy, President of the National Organization for Women, observes that "when such extremism is allowed to flourish anywhere in the world, none of us is safe." When confronted with these unspeakable events, however, the moral relativists who infest our college campuses and progressive institutions respond with juvenile slogans like "one man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter." In New York City, popular graffiti artist and left-wing dissident De La Vega has a statement hanging in his gallery that reads "Osama, whether right or wrong, is a fighter for freedom." Following the logic of this idiocy, we should elevate Hitler’s Holocaust and South Africa’s apartheid into noble ideals simply because some illiterate thugs were willing to shed blood on their behalf. Thankfully, we do nothing of the sort. Just what sort of freedom do people like De La Vega think bin Laden and the Taliban are fighting for? Freedom to throw acid in the faces of unveiled women? Freedom to torture and murder gays, Jews, and atheists? Anyone suggesting a similarity between the values of Martin Luther King and Mullah Omar ought to put down the placard, quit the protest, and hide their head in shame. The Islamic fascists have brought nightmare to life in their own lands, while their ideology calls for its export. To profess pacifism in the face of such horror is to appease evil itself.

#### Rational, self-interested, and fully offensive war on jihadists ought not be interrogated

Lewis, 11

(John David Lewis, associate professor in the Philosophy, Politics, and Economics Program at Duke. “9/11 Ten Years Later: The Fruits of the Philosophy of Self-Abnegation” <http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2011-fall/911-ten-years-later.asp>) Henge

History is littered with the detritus of attacks by tribal gangs against civilized world powers. In the past, nations under siege rose up with righteous anger and visited the full measure of their force upon their enemies. Although they often made costly mistakes, they did not make excuses for their foes while their own city burned. They did not blame themselves for the assaults of their enemies, and they never engaged in prostrate self-abnegation to atone for the carnage. They did not apologize for defending themselves. Apologetic self-abnegation, however, is the hallmark of America’s approach today. Attacked on our own soil and across the globe, we have refused to accept that the cause of the slaughter is the openly stated commitment of clerics, pundits, and political leaders to a barbaric ideology of religious war. Schools in Pakistan train Taliban jihadists who kill Americans while we negotiate with so-called “moderates” among them. University academics scream about American sins, praise bloody tyrannies as “liberation movements,” and call Israel “occupied territory.” Newspaper columns predict the ascendance of political Islam, while the maniacal theocracy of Iran makes the prophecy real. Clerics issue fatwas sanctioning the murder of blasphemous writers and artists. Young people are indoctrinated into jihad as the path to paradise. Killers who enjoy the ambrosia of American life murder American soldiers at American military bases. To explain this litany of aggression we search doggedly for evidence of our own malfeasance. We atone for our alleged sins by showering foreign dictatorships with money and the sanction of diplomatic discussions. We apologize for every dead civilian, even as the enemy hides behind defenseless children and flees into safe havens across foreign borders. We offer constitutional protections to murderers pledged to destroy our Constitution. Why are we doing this? What has brought us to this state? The answers are all around us, in the ideas bombarding us from every direction. Don’t judge other cultures—your own has much to answer for. Don’t invoke history—your colonial past was criminal, and your victims seek restitution for crimes against their ancestors. Don’t cite economics—your system is oppressive, and foreign peoples are trying to free themselves from you. Don’t be certain you are right—there is no right. Deny your own value—your self-esteem is a veneer to mask your evil. Never mind that your culture drew millions to your shores, desperate to escape centuries of stagnation, famine, and wars. Forget the fact that your “colonialism” brought laws and a measure of civilization to people mired in primitive tribalism. Evade the fact that your system created the greatest riches in history by setting men free, and that the wealth of foreign people today is directly proportional to the extent they have emulated you. Never mind that all this is good, for there is no standard of the good beyond a consensus of subjective opinions. Don’t be proud—suppress any thought that you have earned the pride you feel in yourself. Most of all, the voices of today’s culture cry incessantly, give up the delusion that you are productive, benevolent people; get off your high horse and recognize your puny moral status. Give up your self-esteem, for you are no better than those to whom “justice” means arranged marriages, public amputations, and stoning for adultery. Self-abnegation is the new path to atonement. This is the intellectual climate we have steeped in for decades. Is it any wonder that we are acting as these ideas demand? This is why, ten years after 9/11, we have not defeated the enemy that used hijacked airliners to murder thousands of Americans before our eyes. The central “evil” we seek to avoid is that of fighting for our own self-interest, so we give a pass to America’s most strident enemies and wage the pretense of war against tertiary foes, justifying those drawn-out bloodlettings as waged for the good of others. “Operation Iraqi Freedom,” not “Operation American Defense,” brought us to Baghdad. We seek an “Exit Strategy,” not a “Victory Strategy,” in Afghanistan. And what was our reward for liberating the Iraqis from Saddam Hussein? A self-imposed, decades-long, multibillion dollar duty to provide food, clothing, medical care, and toilets to the Iraqis. That, and the rise of Iran into a regional, and soon nuclear, power—these were our rewards. In the course of these wars, we have sacrificed the best of our people to self-abnegating rules of engagement. One Navy SEAL team, isolated behind enemy lines and fearing prosecution for murder should they break the “rules,” released hostile shepherds, who betrayed the SEALs to an enemy force, which ambushed them. When another SEAL team was annihilated by an enemy warrior, we conducted an “investigation” rather than a forthright offensive. When American soldiers return to their families maimed or in coffins, we praise their sacrifice but do not obliterate their foes. Rather than act aggressively abroad, we react aggressively at home by turning inward and building the infrastructure of a police state in our airports and schools. What else should we call the Department of Homeland Security, with its body-searching of American children? Like self-flagellating monks crushed by guilt, we scourge our own skins rather than the skins of those who launched the jihad. That an article such as this, if published in most newspapers, would result in a flurry of letters exclaiming our culpability in the attacks against us is a measure of how deeply Americans have accepted the philosophy of self-abnegation. The deepest cause of this malady oozes out of the ideas that permeate our culture. Intellectually, we have refused to face the fact that we are at war and should act to end it quickly. Morally, we have denied all principles except one: moral goodness means self-sacrifice. Psychologically, we lack confidence in our efficacy, and have murdered our self-esteem by leaping into the quicksand of sacrifice. Politically, we are at perpetual war, because to win decisively would be an act of self-interest—and that is the one action we dare not take. These are the fruits of the philosophy of self-abnegation. Until we repudiate the ideas that bear these fruits and embrace a philosophy of reason and self-esteem, we can expect more of the same, into a darkening future.

#### Mercy/egalitarianism link

Bernstein, 8

(Andrew Bernstein, professor of philosophy at Marist College and SUNY Purchase. “Objectivism in One Lesson” pg. 84-85) Henge

Several widely-held moral theories clash with the virtue of justice. One is the principle of mercy, which is defined as: unearned forgiveness. Mercy applies only to the evil and stipulates an undeserved condonance of its transgressions. Good men seek justice, not mercy; they ask only what they deserve or have coming to them. But the wicked seek to escape their due requital; they desire to inflict harm and avoid proper retaliation. Many moral codes endorse mercy, but Christianity takes especial delight in this flagrant abrogation of justice. By refusing to appropriately punish evil, this principle fails to deter it, thereby emboldening it to ever greater atrocities, and thereby inevitably harming the good. The moral creed of mercy, in essence, offers up the good as a sacrifice to the evil. Even worse, however, is the modernist code of egalitarianism. This is the theory that urges the eradication of justice and the imposing of an attitude of universal moral equality. The theory holds that "equality supersedes justice." To be blunt, if all men deserve equal evaluation and treatment, then there exist no moral distinctions between Thomas Jefferson and Adolf Hitler. According to egalitarianism, "the most heroic creator on earth, the most abysmal villain, and every person in between, should share equally in every value, from love to prestige to money to important jobs ... regardless of what any individual deserves or earns ..... Egalitarianism represents a full collapse from a rational code of assessing men's moral character; it offers a blank check to evil. If no moral distinctions hold, then no disapprobation or punishment can redound to the commission of even the most heinous crimes. More important, no pride or praise should properly result from the performance of the most heroically life-supporting deeds. 17 Egalitarianism is the most vilely consistent annulment of justice ever proposed- but injustice in any of its incarnations has but one inescapable result: the abandonment of the good to the unrestrained depredations of the evil.

### Capitalism

#### Capitalism is REALLY good

Bernstein, 8

(Andrew Bernstein, professor of philosophy at Marist College and SUNY Purchase. “Objectivism in One Lesson” pg. 51-52) Henge

Ayn Rand's unqualified endorsement of laissez-faire capitalism represents a second instance of non-contradictory integration. For example, prior to the capitalist revolution of the 18th century Enlightenment, Europeans lived under monarchical despotism and in miserable penury. But the principle of individual rights liberated commoners from bondage to the aristocrats, freed them to pursue their own happiness and to deploy their rational minds in that quest; freed them to advance in every field of human endeavor-including applied science and technology-and thereby enormously boosted both living standards and life expectancies.8 Further, her support of capitalism integrates not merely with historical knowledge but with the science of economics, which establishes that only the free market system is capable of creating a widespread abundance of consumer goods-and that statism of any form, emphatically including all types of socialism, leads necessarily to widespread destitution. One critical principle in this regard is that the freedom of the capitalist system liberates every man to employ his mind in the production of the values required by human life. When man's survival instrument is unrestrained, more men will survive, for longer periods of time, and at higher living standards.9 . Above all, advocacy of capitalism coheres with the rational principles of philosophy that Ayn Rand herself identified. For example, because men need to . egoistically achieve values in order to live, they must have the legal right to pursue them; therefore, the principle of individual rights, and a limited Constitutional government to protect such rights, is necessary. (See Chapter Eleven.) Related, since the mind is mankind's survival instrument, men must be free to apply their rational judgment to questions of practical life without need to gain permission, including that of the state. Virtue requires men to be consistently rational-and capitalism, by protecting each individual's inalienable right to employ his own mind, is the sole system that enables them to be so. (See Chapter Nine.) A final moral point: since (according to Objectivism) the good is that which promotes man's life on earth, capitalism, by enabling the explosion of creative, life-giving advances proceeding from the protection of men's right to their own lives and minds, is a good of virtually unprecedented historical proportions.( See Chapter Eight.) Deeper, rationality (and its method of objectivity) are required of men because of the metaphysical truth of the primacy of existence principle. Capitalism- the sole system liberating men's rational minds-is thereby the sole system fully congruent with this deepest truth of reality. (See Chapters Five and Six.)

### Extinction

#### Reason and rationality are the tool of human survival

Bernstein, 8

(Andrew Bernstein, professor of philosophy at Marist College and SUNY Purchase. “Objectivism in One Lesson” pg. 25-26) Henge

Observe that Ayn Rand's heroes and heroines are men and women of the mind, brilliant thinkers who discover new knowledge or identify innovative methods by which to apply that knowledge to the benefit of man's life. Howard Roark, for example, is an architectural genius; Dagny Taggart, a brilliant businesswoman/engineer; John Galt, a monumental intellect who revolutionizes men's understanding in both physics and philosophy. Are these characters mere fictitious creations on the author's part-or do they have important analogues in reality? It has been said that we "stand on the shoulders of giants," and the shoulders most responsible for carrying mankind out of the caves and into modern industrial civilization belong to intellectual giants. From Aristotle, who identified the methods of proper reasoning-to Isaac Newton, who revolutionized our understanding of nature-to Thomas Edison, the most accomplished inventor of history-to many other such examples from history it has been the men of intellectual genius who are fundamentally responsible for mankind's most important advances. The values human life requires do not exist antecedently in nature; they must be created by human effort. Every one of those values is a creation of the human mind. One life-giving example is the advances in medicine that result in new treatments and cures for lethal diseases. Such medications and surgical methods must be researched and developed, requiring knowledge of the science of biology, which requires the rational mind. Similarly, our houses and buildings require knowledge of architecture, as well as of the principles of engineering and mathematics, which require the mind. Further, the food that mankind grows depends on understanding agricultural science-how to fertilize the soil, how to irrigate, when to rotate crops, when to let the land lie fallow, how to genetically engineer new strains of food, etc. -all of which require the reasoning mind. Because all values on which human life depend are creations of the rational faculty, Ayn Rand identified the mind as mankind's survival instrument. All species are endowed by nature with certain characteristics by which they survive. The birds, for example, have wings, which enable them to fly. The lions have claws and fangs, with which to rend their prey. The antelopes have great foot speed, which permits them to outrun the lions. Elephants possess vast size and strength rendering them impervious to predatory attack. These animal species survive by physicalistic attributes and activities. But man lacks the bodily characteristics of these animal species; he is without great size, strength or speed of foot. He possesses no wings, fur, fangs or claws. Nature endows him with one instrument by means of which to seek survival, and only one: reason. Man cannot survive except through his mind. He comes on earth unarmed. His brain is his only weapon. Animals obtain food by force. Man has no claws, no fangs, no horns, no great strength of muscle. He must plant his food or hunt it. To plant, he needs a process of thought. To hunt, he needs weapons, and to make weapons - a process of thought. I

### Impact Calculus

#### The choice to be a hero outweighs any consequence

Bernstein, 8

(Andrew Bernstein, professor of philosophy at Marist College and SUNY Purchase. “Objectivism in One Lesson” pg. 62-64) Henge

Further, death and/or physical torture are by no means the only dangers faced by those whose thinking outstrips that of their peers. In France, for example, Voltaire and Diderot were each imprisoned by the ancient regime for the boldness of their thought-and D' Alembert intimidated into temporarily severing ties with the writing of the Encyclopedie. Social ostracism is also a penalty imposed on innovative minds. Darwin's ideas, for example, were (and still are) opposed by religious fundamentalists. Pasteur's germ theory was considered crazy, Fulton's steamboat labeled a "folly," skyscrapers, suspension bridges, and electricity feared as dangerous. But the independent thinkers refused to relent; they continued the battle to develop and spread their ideas-and, in time, they triumphed.4 These creators are the greatest heroes of the human race, and illustrate several important principles: man's heroic potential-and the nature of heroism. Human beings can rise to extraordinary achievement because the instrument that enables them to confront the challenges involved in creating values-the mind-is under their direct, volitional, individual control. Socrates chose to face death rather than yield his conclusions. Galileo chose to publish his great work defending the heliocentric theory in astronomy, Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems-Ptolemaic and Copernican, even though he had been warned not to by Church authorities. Darwin chose to face calumny and the wrath of Christian fundamentalists rather than abandon his mind. Nor must one be a genius to choose unswerving commitment to one's rational conclusions. So-called "ordinary men" have often risen to heights of moral grandeur by supporting what they know to be true or right against formidable opposition. For example: honest police officers have struggled incorruptibly not only against gangsters-but, at times, against graft within their own department. Some teachers have battled for phonics against school boards seeking to impose the disastrous "look-say" method of teaching reading, and others have fought for inclusion of evolution on the science curriculum-all struggling to further education and the mind. As a final illustration, the prisons of tyrants around the globe are filled with political prisoners, i.e., with those whose only "crime" was to think and speak out against the abuses of the regime. The choice to be committed to one's mind-and to truth-is not the exclusive prerogative of the genius. Observe the logical progression of Ayn Rand's thought. The achievement of values makes possible man's survival. Man's rational faculty is the instrument by which he attains values. His rational faculty-his survival instrument-is under each individual's direct control. Therefore, the pursuit of values-the quest for a noble success-the ability to face and surmount daunting obstacles the refusal to ever surrender the struggle-are all under a man's volitional control. Heroism is the relentless employment of man's survival instrument-against any and all opposition-in the quest for the values that make human life possible. In The Fountainhead and Atlas Shrugged, Ayn Rand provides vivid por traits of the heroic potential in man's nature. Howard Roark conceives fundamental new truths regarding architecture; he is opposed by virtually all of society, including the woman he loves across a period spanning decades; he must battle against entrenched beliefs, social institutions, and governmental prohibitions; yet, he remains unwavering in his dedication to his standards, and in the end he triumphs. The heroes of Atlas Shrugged identify a vital principle of human existence- the right of a man to live for his own sake-and defend it against a collectivist society intent on enslaving the individual. They go on strike, fighting for the freedom of man's mind, and in the end, succeed in transfiguring the world. Even in cases where a hero's conflict includes physicalistic action, as with criminal investigations or military operations, serious thought is involved. First: effective police work or military campaigns themselves require diligent application of the mind; such activities are not governed by mindlessly brute force. For example, competent law officers think regarding the identity of a perpetrator and the means of apprehending him; efficacious soldiers think about strategy and tactics. Further, law officers and the volunteer soldiers of a free country have chosen the right side of the ongoing struggle between good and evil. They need some understanding of virtue to make such a choice-and to gain that, they must think. Related, the police officers and military men of a free society, in varying forms, protect the rights of honest, productive men to freely employ their survival instrument in the quest for flourishing life. Such men are heroes because their valorous deeds are performed in protection o/the mind. Heroism, in any of its forms, involves a volitionally-chosen course of action in support of man's mind and his ability to attain values. The hero is loyal to the mind and its achievements against any and all foes. Ayn Rand states that her philosophy holds "the concept of man as a heroic being." It is now possible to see why. The mind is the creator of all the values on which human life depends. A hero is an individual consistently loyal to the mind in all contexts, one who creates and/or defends the rational values required by man's life, and one who chooses to do so in the face of any form of opposition. This point constitutes a re-statement of The Lesson in a new form: Man's potential for heroism lies in his "capacity to choose unrelenting commitment to the mind and its works in the face of any obstacles and all alternatives. This is the potential inherent in human nature. This could be anyone of us. One need not be a genius to achieve exalted moral stature. Most of us cannot match the intellectual achievements of a Newton, Shakespeare or the fictitious John Galt, but we can match their dedication to the unbreached use of the mind. We can use our own intelligence to the conscientious best of our ability, always seeking in all contexts to identify truth-to stand by it and to live in accordance with it. There is a function served in The Fountainhead by the character of Roark's trusted friend, the construction worker, Mike Donnigan-and in Atlas Shrugged by Dagny's conscientious assistant, Eddie Willers. Neither are the geniuses that Roark and Dagny are; both are individuals of more modest intelligence; but both consistently face facts, employ their minds to perform their scrupulous best, and never evade or deny ugly truths. Their moral stature equals that of the great heroes. The all-important field of morality, as we will see in detail in subsequent chapters, is open equally to all regardless of ability. Related is the point that individuals will reach differing levels of success. For a variety of reasons, some will achieve at a higher level than others. For example, Henry Cameron fails to reach the level of success attained ultimately by Howard Roark-and in Edmond Rostand's great play, Cyrano de Bergerac dies without achieving any of his practical goals. As one real-life example, the astronaut, James Lovell, never fulfilled his years-long dream to walk on the moon-but he flew four times in space, journeyed twice to the moon, and commanded Apollo 13, the venture whose luckless fate merely set the stage for one of mankind's most glorious episodes of heroism. All three of the above individuals, fictitious as well as real, are heroes. Some circumstances are not under a man's direct, volitional control. For example, he may be born with a physical ailment incurable by the medical science of his day-or he may be the victim of an accident, disease or natural disaster- or he might be thwarted by the mistaken or even irrational choices of others, etc. Because of such uncontrollable factors, a man need not necessarily reach his specific practical goals in order to be a hero. But his rational consciousness and moral character are subject to his command. Therefore, to reach the level of heroism, a man need not be undefeated in quest of the specific rational values he pursues; he need merely be undaunted. It has been seen, in essence, that reason is man's survival instrument; that man must choose its use, i.e., that he possesses free will; that each man holds direct control of his means of survival; and that the individuals who choose consistently to exercise it are the greatest achievers or heroes of the human race.

### AT—Permutation

#### The permutation is the surrendering of values

Bernstein, 8

(Andrew Bernstein, professor of philosophy at Marist College and SUNY Purchase. “Objectivism in One Lesson” pg. 13-16) Henge

In The Fountainhead, the story of Catherine Halsey provides a perfect example- and a cautionary tale. After she surrenders every personal value-her education, her prospective marriage, her ambition-to serve her uncle, Ellsworth Toohey, and join his "humanitarian" cause, she subsists in a hollow state, an empty, bitter husk, which had once contained a vibrantly innocent soul. The selfless surrender of one's values logically necessitates the draining of all that provides meaning in one's life-and the miserably unfulfilled existence that inexorably follows. Selfishness, properly understood, involves a commitment to one's self. The deeper question, therefore, becomes: What, fundamentally, is a man's self? Ayn Rand's answer is: at one level, his values, the things he considers most important; at a deeper level, his mind - the thinking he performed in identifying and choosing those values. There is a scene in The Fountainhead that perfectly illustrates Ayn Rand's theory of selfishness as adherence to one's own values and mind. Roark at first struggles because his method of designing is radically new. Near the end of Part One, he has had no commissions for months, he is down to a few dollars in his bank account, and he is overdue on his payment of rent and utilities. His hopes are pinned on the prospective commission to design the Manhattan Bank Building. The Board of Directors has kept him waiting as they debated their choice. Finally, they offer to hire him-but with one qualification: they demand to make extraneous and inappropriate changes to his design. Though Roark explains that, like a man, a building should have integrity and, similarly, be consistent throughout, the board insists on its alterations in accordance with conventional standards. Roark is forced to choose: an important commission, albeit with an adulterated design-or the maintenance of his artistic integrity, with a consequent loss of a significant commercial prospect. Roark refuses the commission on those terms, thereby losing the opportunity. When one of the Board members accuses his uncompromising stand of being "fanatical and selfless," Roark is incredulous. "Roark smiled. He looked down at his drawings. His elbow moved a little, pressing them to his body. He said: 'That was the most selfish thing you've ever seen a man do.",4 Since Roark had just rejected a major commission in the heart of New York City, which would have brought him money, fame, and increased opportunities in order to stand by a moral principle - the preservation of his building's integrity - the discerning reader of The Fountainhead will ask: How is this selfish? What is selfish about Roark's action? The answer to these questions penetrates to the heart of Ayn Rand's revolutionary moral theory. We have already seen that, on Ayn Rand's understanding, selfishness involves commitment to one's self. If the essence of one's self is one's values and the judgment employed in choosing those values, then the question becomes: what is Roark's self? In The Fountainhead, Roark's value hierarchy is made abundantly clear: architecture of his kind- "My work done my way" -stands at the top of his personal pantheon. It is instructive to note his answer to Henry Cameron regarding his reasons for his commitment to his kind of architecture. He states: "Because I love this earth. That's all I love. I don't like the shape of things on this earth. I want to change them." "For whom?" [Cameron asks.] "For myself." Roark seeks to transform this earth, to make its structures beautifully functional, to implement an architectural vision that he alone can see-one recognizable to others only through the actualization of his genius. This is the animating purpose of his life. Additionally, of course, there exist several persons who are also of great importance to him, notably Dominique Francon, Gail Wynand, and Henry Cameron. These are Roark's highest values.5 Money, although a value, is of lesser importance to him. He wants to make money; like any honest man, he knows he must support himself by his own work; and he expects to be paid-as a rule, he does not give his designs away for nothing. But he wants to get paid for designing his kind of building. Roark seeks to build a successful long-term practice-with its attendant prosperity and recognizes that the only effectual means to such an end is to offer his clients works of matchless integrity. He understands that wealth earned in this manner is a superlative good; but that money will provide him no benefit if, in the exchange, he gives up his mind, judgment, and soul, i.e., the very things that make his life and work so precious to him. Similarly, recognition-when it comes from individuals like Dominique or Austen Heber, who understand and admire his work for the right reasons-is a value. But the right reasons include preeminently the recognition of the design's flawless consistency, which is not to be breached. A related general point is that a rational man chooses to enter into human relationships, business or personal, only because the values shared with others enable such relationships to enhance his wellbeing: they bring educational progress, commercial opportunities, and/or the joy of intimacy, friendship or love. Roark's relationships-with Cameron, Dominique, Wynand, et. al.-are on the basis of shared values and, consequently, bring great meaning into his life. In brief, Roark remains true to that which is primary to his life and happiness, and refuses to betray it for what are-to him-secondary benefits. (It should be noted as an important derivative point that there is full congruence between selfishness in Ayn Rand's sense and benevolent goodwill toward one's fellow man. It is eminently possible-indeed, normal- that as one benefits one's self, others benefit, as well. Properly understood, another person's attainment of values is no threat to one's own achievements, and one's own achievements are no threat to anyone else's. To the contrary, in pursuing his own interest, a rational man in the process often helps others advance their selfish interests. For example: by aiding those he loves-his friends, family members, wife, children, et. al.-a rational man advances both their happiness and his own. If he loves his career, whether as teacher, physician, businessman, etc., and works to the conscientious best of his ability, he simultaneously earns his living, takes pride and fulfillment in his work, and benefits all those who have the opportunity to interact with him: his students, patients, customers, et. al. More broadly, if he recognizes that honest men are an enormous benefit to his life-and he to theirs-then his relationships of trading values for values will be fulfilling to all involved. There is, Ayn Rand argued, no clash of interests be tween truly rational, selfish individuals.)6 It is eminently possible to benefit both oneself and others. But it is logically impossible to both fulfill and sacrifice oneself, to both pursue and surrender important values, to gain happiness and selflessly relinquish the personal values upon which happiness depends.

#### The permutation is the ultimate example of self-sacrifice—can’t solve

Bernstein, 8

(Andrew Bernstein, professor of philosophy at Marist College and SUNY Purchase. “Objectivism in One Lesson” pg. 16) Henge

To be true to the self is to be true to one's values. This is exactly what Roark does. He remains true to his highest value, refusing to sacrifice it. To sacrifice is to give up a higher value for a lesser value or a non-value. It is not a sacrifice if a man gives up something of little or no importance to him, in order to gain something more valuable. For Roark, it would be a sacrifice to adulterate his design in order to obtain money and fame. That would be surrendering his highest value for things of lesser or no importance. This he refuses to do. Roark's striking words to the Board regarding his selfishness express his commitment to remain true to his values, to the essence of his self, in action and though under severe financial duress. In this scene, Ayn Rand, in effect, dramatizes the meaning of Polonius's famous words to Laertes in Hamlet: "To thine own self be true." For when a man is true, in action, to his supreme values, it is his self that he honors above all. This is selfishness in Ayn Rand's sense of the term. In real life, a loving parent will save money for his child's education, possibly forgoing a new car or some other luxury. A young married couple, living in their first apartment, might scrimp on vacations or recreation in order to gain the money necessary for a down payment on a house of their own. A serious college student will study for long hours and possibly hold a job, thereby curtailing elements of his social life, because he is working toward a future career of great significance to him. All of these persons and thousands more, are true to their values. None of them are willing to undermine or betray that which is of utmost importance to them. All of them are, in Ayn Rand's sense, properly selfish. Further, notice the practicality of Roark's selfish commitment to his principles. He knows that sacrificing the integrity of his design will make him miserable, not happy. Additionally, it is true that the Manhattan Bank Building will establish his reputation-but as what? As a man willing to compromise his designs. The Board's version of his building will attract clients to him, but ones that prefer the debased in art to the flawlessly consistent. His type of clients, the ones who admire only the best in men and their work-the Austen Hellers, Roger Enrights, Gail Wynands-will be repulsed by a building that has sold its soul. It would take Roark years to live down that building. He recognizes that only consistent selfishness-a scrupulous commitment to his values, an inviolate integrity-will enable him to reach the practical success to which he aspires. People often mistakenly equate "practicality" with gaining as much wealth as possible. Certainly, Ayn Rand holds that wealth well earned is a great value. In reality, practicality includes earning wealth, but is a broader concept. It means attaining your personal values and gaining fulfillment and happiness. Roark is a superbly practical man, because, by remaining unswervingly true to his values, he brings them to an exultant fruition.

### AT—Racist

#### The problem isn’t with brown people, but with modern Islam

Bernstein, 13

(Andrew Bernstein, professor of philosophy at Marist College and SUNY Purchase. “Great Islamic Thinkers Versus Islam” <http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2012-winter/great-islamic-thinkers-versus-islam.asp>) Henge

Claims of an “Islamic Golden Age,” from roughly the 8th to the 12th centuries, are not politically correct propaganda; such a Golden Age was real. During that period, numerous thinkers of the Arab-Islamic world—many of them committed Muslims—wrought significant advances in mathematics, astronomy, medicine, literature, and other fields. Sadly, that era came to an end; tragically, for the past eight hundred years, it has not been revitalized; terrifyingly, during those centuries—and continuing today—religious fervor has superseded reason and crushed intellectual culture under Islam. For fully eight centuries, the Islamic world first coasted on its past glories and, then, collapsed into a cultural Dark Age, where it remains. Who were these great thinkers? What were their accomplishments? Who influenced them? And why did Islamic culture ultimately reject reason and fully embrace faith? This intellectual battle between reason and faith, and its tragic outcome, forms the fundamental reason that modern Islam is a deadly menace to human civilization. Any rational person, of any creed, anywhere—within or outside the Muslim world—who seeks to protect reason and freedom from the Islamists, needs to understand them and their bitter hostility to the independent mind, and therefore needs to understand the intellectual battle that shaped modern Islamist premises.

## 1NR—Disidentification

### Impact Stuff

#### We’re turning the case -- their wester epistemology arguments are all ways they trap the minonritarian subject into the state power aparatus.

Muñoz 99 (José Estabon, Professor of Performance arts at NYU, Disidentifications: Queers of Color and the Performance of Politics, p. 97)IAA

Disidentification is a performative mode of tactical recognition that vari-ous minoritarian subjects employ in an effort to resist the oppressive and normalizing discourse of dominant ideology. Disidentification resists the interpellating call of ideology that fixes a subject within the state power apparatus. § Marked 12:39 § It is a reformatting of self within the social, a third term that resists the binary of identification and counteridentification. Counteri-dentification often, through the very routinized workings of its denounce-ment of dominant discourse, reinstates that same discourse. In an inter-view in the magazine aRude, Davis offers one of the most lucid explications of a modality of performance that I call disidentificatory.

### Alt

#### Queer disidentifying performances allows minoritarian subjects to gain social agency.

Muñoz 99 (José Estabon, Professor of Performance arts at NYU, Disidentifications: Queers of Color and the Performance of Politics, p. 1,)

There is a certain lure to the spectacle of one queer standing onstage alone, with or without props, bent on the project of opening up a world of queer language, lyricism, perceptions, dreams, visions, aesthetics, and politics. So—lo performance speaks to the reality of\_ being queer at this particular moment. More than two decades into a devastating pandemic, with hate crimes and legislation aimed at queers and people of color institutionalized as state protocols, the act of performing and theatricalizing queerness in public takes on ever multiplying significance. I feel this lure, this draw, when I encounter Marga Gomez's performances. Marga Gomez Is Pretty, Witty, and Gay, a 1992 performance by the Cuban and Puerto Rican-American artist, is a meditation on the contemporary reality of being queer in North America. Gomez's show is staged on a set that is meant to look like her bedroom. Much of her monologue is delivered from her bed. The space of a queer bedroom is thus brought into the public purview of dominant culture. Despite the Bowers v. Hardwick U.S. Supreme Court decision, which has efficiently dissolved the right to privacy of all gays and lesbians, in essence opening all our bedrooms to the state, Gomez willfully and defiantly performs her pretty, witty, and gay self in public. Her performance permits the spectator, often a queer who has been locked out of the halls of representation or rendered a static caricature there, to imagine a world where queer lives, politics, and possibilities are representable in their complexity. The irnportance of such public and semipublic enactments of the hybrid self cannot be undervalued in relation to the formation of counterpublics that contest the hege- , monic supremacy of the majoritarian public sphere. Spectacles such as those that Gomez presents offer the minoritarian subject a space to situate itself in history and thus seize social agency.