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#### Terrorism is rooted in a history of political failures to embrace egoism—the aff rejects the government’s fundamental obligation to fight the war on terror no matter the cost 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

#### In imagination of the future necessitate norms of reproduction that always exclude the queer body—the exclusion of the Other becomes necessary to the identity of the included

Edelman ’98 (Lee, English Prof @ Tufts University, The Ohio State University Press, Narrative, Vol. 6, No. 1, January, p. 18-30, “The Future is Kid Stuff: Queer Theory, Disidentification and the Death Drive”, JSTOR, AO)

In what follows I want to interrogate the politics that informs the pervasive trope of the child as figure for the universal value attributed to political futurity and to pose against it the impossible project of a queer oppositionality that would oppose itself to the structural determinants of politics as such, which is also to say, that would oppose itself to the logic of opposition. This paradoxical formulation suggests the energy of resistance the characteristically perverse resistance informing the work of queer theory to the substantialization of identities, especially as defined through opposition, as well as to the political fantasy of shaping history into a narrative in which meaning succeeds in revealing itself, as itself, through time. By attempting to resist that coercive faith in political futurity, while refusing as well any hope for the sort of dialectical access to meaning that such resistance, as quintessential political gesture, holds out, I mean to insist that politics is always a politics of the signifier, and that queer theory's interventions in the reproduction of dominant cultural logics must never lose sight of its figurai relation to the vicissitudes of signification. Queer theory, as a particular story of where storytelling fails, one that takes the value and burden of that failure upon itself, occupies, I want to suggest, the impossible "other" side where narrative realization and derealization overlap. The rest of this paper as pires to explain the meaning and implications of that assertion, but to do so it must begin by tracing some connections between politics and the politics of the sign. Like the network of signifying relations Lacan described as the symbolic, politics may function as the register within which we experience social reality, but only insofar as it compels us to experience that reality in the form of a fantasy: the fantasy, precisely, of form as such, of an order, an organization, assuring the stability of our identities as subjects and the consistency of the cultural structures through which those identities are reflected back to us in recognizable form. Though the material conditions of human experience may indeed be at stake in the various conflicts by means of which differing political perspectives vie for the power to name, and by naming to shape, our collective reality, the ceaseless contestation between and among their competing social visions expresses a common will to install as reality itself one libidinal-subtended fantasy or another and thus to avoid traumatically confronting the emptiness at the core of the symbolic "reality" produced by the order of the signifier. To put this otherwise: politics designates the ground on which imaginary relations, relations that hark back to a notion of the self-misrecognized as en joying an originary fullness an undifferentiated presence that is posited retroactively and therefore lost, one might say, from the start compete for symbolic fulfillment within the dispensation of the signifier. For the mediation of the signifier alone allows us to articulate these imaginary relations, though always at the price of introducing the distance that precludes their realization: the distance inherent in the chain of ceaseless deferrals and mediations to which the very structure of the linguistic system must give birth. The signifier, as alienating and meaningless token of our symbolic construction as subjects, as token, that is, of our subjectification through subjection to the prospect of meaning; the signifier, by means of which we always inhabit the order of the Other, the order of a social and linguistic reality articulated from somewhere else; the signifier, which calls us into meaning by seeming to call us to ourselves, only ever confers upon us a sort of promissory identity, one with which we never succeed in fully coinciding because we, as subjects of the signifier, can only be signifiers ourselves: can only ever aspire to catch up, to close the gap that divides and by dividing calls forth ourselves as subjects. Politics names those processes, then, through which the social subject attempts to secure the conditions of its consolidation by identifying with what is outside it in order to bring it into the presence, deferred perpetually, of itself.

#### Predictions and risk analysis in debate is not accurate forecasting. Rather, it’s a way to imagine and harness the uncertain future, allowing imagined scenarios to call the shots of the present.

De Goede 08 (Marieke, Department of European Studies, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands. “Beyond Risk: Premediation and the Post-9/11 Security Imagination” Security Dialogue Vol. 39, no. 2-3, April)

Premediation is a promising term to denote the discursive economies through which terrorist futures are imagined, because it draws attention to the cultural practices of mediation at work. It draws attention to the cultural work performed by news media and entertainment industries, as well as by security ‘experts’, consultants and policymakers – whom Didier Bigo calls the ‘managers of unease’ – in envisioning possible terrorist futures (Bigo, 2002; see also Huysmans, 2006). The close conjunction between the Hollywood culture industry and these ‘managers of unease’ has long been noted by authors like James Der Derian (2001), who coined the term ‘military–industrial–media– entertainment network’ to denote this nexus. For example, Der Derian (2005: 30) notes how, shortly after 9/11, the Institute for Creative Technologies in California – which, according to its website, is dedicated to ‘building partnerships between the entertainment industry, army, and academia’ – began to gather Hollywood screenwriters and directors in order to ‘create possible terrorist scenarios that could be played out in their Marina del Rey virtual reality facilities’ (see also Campbell, 2003: 59–64; Boggs & Pollard, 2006). Security premediation is enabled through a broader turn to risk management as a security technology in diverse domains of modern life (Simon, 2007; O’Malley, 2004). In the ‘war on terror’, technologies of risk management foster new security initiatives, such as automated passenger screening at borders and the risk-based detection of suspicious financial transactions (Amoore & de Goede, 2008; Amoore, 2006; Sparke, 2006; Zureik & Salter, 2005). This deployment of risk in the ‘war on terror’ articulates two worlds of post-9/11 globalization: the world of legitimate and productive movement that is to be fostered and expedited, and the world of illegitimate and suspect movement that is to be stopped, questioned and detained. It is on the basis of risk assessment and calculation that ‘legitimate’ flows of money, goods and people are to be separated from the suspect, illegitimate and underground. As Sparke (2006: 13) writes of risk-based ‘smart border’ technologies, their promise is to deliver ‘economic liberty and homeland security with a hightech fix’. Risk and premediation, then, proceed from a shared desire: to imagine, harness and commodify the uncertain future. They share a technological history through their appeal to uncertainty as both a source of threat *and* a spur to creativity. As Pat O’Malley (2004: 4) shows in his exploration of particular representations of risk in management literatures**,** uncertainty was never *just* a threat to be subdued or eradicated, but was always celebrated for fostering ‘entrepreneurial creativity’ and ‘transformative power’. According to O’Malley (2004: 5), Uncertainty . . . is to be the fluid art of the possible. It involves techniques of flexibility and adaptability, requires a certain kind of ‘vision’ that may be thought of as intuition but is nevertheless capable of being explicated at great length in terms such as . . . ‘governing with foresight.’ Both premediation and (particular forms of) risk management straddle the paradox of celebrating uncertainty while desiring to eradicate it – fostering booming business practices in the process (see Baker & Simon, 2002b; Lobo- Guerrero, 2007). At the same time however, there are substantial differences between risk assessment and what Grusin calls premediation. Most importantly, premediation is not chiefly in the business of *forecasting*. As Grusin (2004: 28) argues, ‘premediation . . . is not necessarily about *getting the future right* as much as it is about trying to imagine or map out as many possible futures as could plausibly be imagined’ (emphasis added). Thus, whereas the logic of risk and forecasting centres on *prediction* of the future, premediation is more selfconsciously ‘creative’ in imagining a variety of futures – some thought likely, others far-fetched, some thought imminent, others long-haul – in order to *enable action in the present.* This is a difference not just in logic or purpose, but also in method: as Grusin (2004: 29) puts it, ‘a weather map does not premediate tomorrow’s storm in the way in which it will be mediated after it strikes’. Instead of the disembodied, statistical and at least seemingly objective method of the forecast, premediation scripts and mediates multiple futures ‘in ways that are almost indistinguishable from the way the future will be mediated when it happens’ (Grusin, 2004: 29). Arguably then, premediation is not about the future *at all*, but about enabling action in the present by visualizing and drawing on multiple imagined futures (Amoore, 2007b). Indeed, as we have seen above, the 9/11 Commission emphasizes precisely this call to action in the present when it understands the challenge of imagination to be ‘to figure out a way to turn a scenario into constructive action’ (9/11 Commission, 2004: 346, emphasis added). Through its selfconscious deployment of imagination, premediation can be understood to address itself to *risk beyond risk* (Ewald, 2002: 249). The imagined catastrophe driving premediation is seen to be simultaneously incalculable *and* demanding new methodologies of calculation and imagination. In this sense, it is akin to a politics of precaution, which, according to Claudia Aradau & Rens van Munster (2007, 2008) is the dispositif through which the ‘war on terror’ has to be understood. ‘Precautionary risk’, write Aradau & van Munster (2007: 101) ‘introduces within the computation of the future its very limit, the infinity of uncertainty and potential damage.’ It is in this very computation of the future at the limit, of course, that financial practices are historically experienced. Indeed, Melinda Cooper (2006: 119) draws out this affinity with speculation when she writes of the logic of precaution: ‘If the catastrophe befalls us, it is from a future without chronological continuity with the past. Though we might suspect something is wrong with the world . . . no mass of information will help us pin-point the precise when, where and how of the coming havoc. *We can only speculate’* (emphasis added).

#### Futurism necessitates violence. The queer must be exterminated in order to achieve harmony.

Stavrakakis 99 (Yannis, Lacanian Psychoanalyst, Lacan and the Political, p. 99-101, Questia,)

Our age is clearly an age of social fragmentation, political disenchantment and open cynicism characterised by the decline of the political mutations of modern universalism—a universalism that, by replacing God with Reason, reoccupied the ground of a pre-modern aspiration to fully represent and master the essence and the totality of the real. On the political level this universalist fantasy took the form of a series of utopian constructions of a reconciled future society. The fragmentation of our present social terrain and cultural milieu entails the collapse of such grandiose fantasies. 1 Today, talk about utopia is usually characterised by a certain ambiguity. For some, of course, utopian constructions are still seen as positive results of human creativity in the socio-political sphere: ‘utopia is the expression of a desire for a better way of being’ (Levitas, 1990:8). Other, more suspicious views, such as the one expressed in Marie Berneri’s book Journey through Utopia, warn—taking into account experiences like the Second World War—of the dangers entailed in trusting the idea of a perfect, ordered and regimented world. For some, instead of being ‘how can we realise our utopias?’, the crucial question has become ‘how can we prevent their final realisation?…. [How can] we return to a non-utopian society, less perfect and more free’ (Berdiaev in Berneri, 1971:309). 2 It is particularly the political experience of these last decades that led to the dislocation of utopian sensibilities and brought to the fore a novel appreciation of human finitude, together with a growing suspicion of all grandiose political projects and the meta-narratives traditionally associated with them (Whitebook, 1995:75). All these developments, that is to say the crisis of the utopian imaginary, seem however to leave politics without its prime motivating force: the politics of today is a politics of aporia. In our current political terrain, hope seems to be replaced by pessimism or even resignation. This is a result of the crisis in the dominant modality of our political imagination (meaning utopianism in its various forms) and of our inability to resolve this crisis in a productive way. 3 In this chapter, I will try to show that Lacanian theory provides new angles through which we can reflect on our historical experience of utopia and reorient our political imagination beyond its suffocating strait-jacket. Let’s start our exploration with the most elementary of questions: what is the meaning of the current crisis of utopia? And is this crisis a development to be regretted or cherished? In order to answer these questions it is crucial to enumerate the conditions of possibility and the basic characteristics of utopian thinking. First of all it seems that the need for utopian meaning arises in periods of increased uncertainty, social instability and conflict, when the element of the political subverts the fantasmatic stability of our political reality. Utopias are generated by the surfacing of grave antagonisms and dislocations in the social field. As Tillich has put it ‘all utopias strive to negate the negative…in human existence; it is the negative in that existence which makes the idea of utopia necessary’ (Tillich in Levitas, 1990:103). Utopia then is one of the possible responses to the ever-present negativity, to the real antagonism which is constitutive of human experience. Furthermore, from the time of More’s Utopia (1516) it is conceived as an answer to the negativity inherent in concrete political antagonism. What is, however, the exact nature of this response? Utopias are images of future human communities in which these antagonisms and the dislocations fuelling them (the element of the political) will be forever resolved, leading to a reconciled and harmonious world—it is not a coincidence that, among others, Fourier names his utopian community ‘Harmony’ and that the name of the Owenite utopian community in the New World was ‘New Harmony’. As Marin has put it, utopia sets in view an imaginary resolution to social contradiction; it is a simulacrum of synthesis which dissimulates social antagonism by projecting it onto a screen representing a harmonious and immobile equilibrium (Marin, 1984:61). This final resolution is the essence of the utopian promise. What I will try to do in this chapter is, first of all, to demonstrate the deeply problematic nature of utopian politics. Simply put, my argument will be that every utopian fantasy construction needs a ‘scapegoat’ in order to constitute itself—the Nazi utopian fantasy and the production of the ‘Jew’ is a good example, especially as pointed out in Žižek’s analysis. 4 Every utopian fantasy produces its reverse and calls for its elimination. Put another way, the beatific side of fantasy is coupled in utopian constructions with a horrific side, a paranoid need for a stigmatised scapegoat. The naivety—and also the danger—of utopian structures is revealed when the realisation of this fantasy is attempted. It is then that we are brought close to the frightening kernel of the real: stigmatisation is followed by extermination. This is not an accident. It is inscribed in the structure of utopian constructions; it seems to be the way all fantasy constructions work. If in almost all utopian visions, violence and antagonism are eliminated, if utopia is based on the expulsion and repression of violence (this is its beatific side) this is only because it owes its own creation to violence; it is sustained and fed by violence (this is its horrific side). This repressed moment of violence resurfaces, as Marin points out, in the difference inscribed in the name utopia itself (Marin, 1984:110). What we shall argue is that it also resurfaces in the production of the figure of an enemy. To use a phrase enunciated by the utopianist Fourier, what is ‘driven out through the door comes back through the window’ (is not this a ‘precursor’ of Lacan’s dictum that ‘what is foreclosed in the symbolic reappears in the real’?—VII:131). 5 The work of Norman Cohn and other historians permits the articulation of a genealogy of this manichean, equivalential way of understanding the world, from the great witch-hunt up to modern anti-Semitism, and Lacanian theory can provide valuable insights into any attempt to understand the logic behind this utopian operation—here the approach to fantasy developed in Chapter 2 will further demonstrate its potential in analysing our political experience. In fact, from the time of his unpublished seminar on The Formations of the Unconscious, Lacan identified the utopian dream of a perfectly functioning society as a highly problematic area (seminar of 18 June 1958).

#### Voting negative is an identification with death, queerness, and negativity in the face of a politics that is only valuable through some reconciled, future order

Schotten 09 (C. Heike, Professor of Political Science at the University of Massachusetts Boston, Nietzsche’s Revolution: Decadence, Politics, and Sexuality, p. 203-6)IAA

Instead of falling prey to the logic of the Child, however, and its imperatives of protection, sacrifice, futurity, and hope, Edelman encourages queers to embrace our stigmatized positioning as the negativity, death, and futurelessness of social life. He boldly admits that this means, in the case of feminists and gay people, adopting the conservative Right's belief that abortion and nonprocreative sexual pleasure lead to the undoing of social life and the downfall of civilization. But this is because social conservatives are right in their insistence that civilization itself depends on the Child or, more generally, in the hope and belief in a future that will validate all present human activity. Queerness, then, undermines this future, and indeed threatens to annihilate its very possibility in its nihilistic excesses. In this analysis, then, "queer" is the name of what threatens the integrity and coherence of social life, a nimble and capacious designation that can encompass far more and disparate numbers of people than simply "homosexuals." If, for example, Reaganites are correct in seeing welfare benefits as stimuli to procreation on the part of helplessly dependent and drug-addicted mothers of color, then Edelman's proposal amounts to demanding that queer politics align and identify itself with these welfare queens (a move that would productively double and ironize the "queen" of this otherwise derogatory term). If Puar's analysis of homonationalism is correct, and if George W. Bush is to be believed that one is either with the U.S. government or one is with the terrorists, then this means that a revolutionary queer project of no future must necessarily align itself with the terrorists as well."' Edelman correctly characterizes this position as "oppositional to the structural logic of opposition"" 8 (a Nietzschean tactic, to be sure), insofar as it refuses to consider childlessness or the lack of futurity— that is, the abyss into which queers would be thrown—an objection. In short, Edelman's suggestion amounts to saying, "More abyss, please!" I think the militancy of Edelman's rhetoric belies a revolutionary desire that augurs liberation from precisely such stultifying heteronormativity. In a superb display of revolutionary rhetoric, for example, Edelman declares: Queers must respond . . . not only by insisting on our equal right to the social order's prerogatives, not only by avowing our capacity to promote that order's coherence and integrity, but also by saying explicitly what [Bernard] Law and the Pope and the whole of the Symbolic order for which they stand hear anyway in each and every expression or manifestation of queer sexuality: Fuck the social order and the Child in whose name we're collectively terrorized; fuck Annie; fuck the waif from Les Mis; fuck the poor, innocent kid on the Net; fuck Laws with both capital /s and with small; fuck the whole network of Symbolic relations and the future that serves as its prop. 120 This is an emancipatory commitment he would surely deny. Edelman insists that he offers no such liberatory hope, since any and all futurity— even revolutionary futurity—is already co-opted by the cult of the Child in whose name the future is always wagered and promised, and from which queers are necessarily prohibited. To hope is thus, in Edelman's view, the political version of "Smearing the Queer." Indeed, Edelman gleefully notes that this choice to own and occupy the space of no future deliberately overcomes the need or possibility for anything like hope. As he says, "we do not intend a new politics, a better society, a brighter tomorrow, since all of these fantasies reproduce the past, through displacement, in the form of the future." 12 ' The future of queer politics, then, is no future at all—it is rather the very narcissistic, future-sacrificing, self-indulgent jouissance for its own sake to which queers are condemned, anyway. I think Edelman is right that we queers—again, an expansive term that includes "all so stigmatized for failing to comply with heteronormative mandates" 122—ought to embrace the very position of nihilistic future assassins to which culture and politics consign us. Where Edelman goes awry, however, is in his conclusion that this signifies the death of hope as well. While it is true that hope is routinely—perhaps even uniquely— symbolized in and by this logic of the Child (a logic we see even in Nietzsche with his redemptive emphasis on self-birthing and Zarathustra's final metamorphosis of the spirit into the child), it still seems to me that if we embrace Edelman's proposal, this is nothing less than the embrace of an explicitly revolutionary politics which lacks dogma but is inextricable from gratification. Indeed, Edelman suggests that we accept the dictates of politics that identifies jouissance with self-indulgence, that sees sex (or insistent presentism) and politics as opposed, and impolitic sex (or carnality) as death. And while this undermining of the very terms of politics is indeed nihilistic, this undermining is also not nihilistic, or else Edelman could not, by definition, advocate it as such. Indeed, unbeknownst to him, Edelman occupies the contradictory and thus revolutionary Nietzschean position of affirming negation. For it is not the Child per se—that is, futurity per se—that is the problem, but [is] the Christian structures of meaning-making that insist that life have a future other than death, that we sacrifice ourselves on the cross of something greater than ourselves. In this sense, Edelman may be diagnosing our current moment of modernity as beholden to the cross of the Child—perhaps this is the next installment in Nietzsche's Genealogy of Morality: first Christianity, then modern science, and now, reproductive futurity. But Edelman cannot help but perform for us that even a politics of no future is both a politics and a future. For, unless we are already dead, death is the future, for all of us. His demand that we not sacrifice ourselves prematurely to it, that we not forsake the present for the future, nor demand that this present wallow in the determinations of the past, is quite undeniably a political proscription, one bent on undermining and in fact undoing the entire social order, the goal of all revolutionaries, last I checked. Unflagging commitment to liberatory political transformation is thus strangely compatible with post-structuralist critique, and I think Edelman (like Nietzsche, and despite Edelman's own protestations) embodies this discordant harmony himself. His longing for a total eradication of the very structures of meaning and temporality that make politics intelligible is nothing less than a desire for the overthrow of everything existing. He is clear, at many points, that this structure is an oppressive one, one that functions on the basis of a binary division imposed on humanity between those selfless people who sacrifice themselves for the future and those selfish ones who, in their endless pursuit of their own gratification, are responsible for the decay of morality, the dissolution of the social order, teen pregnancy, skyrocketing delinquency, and the AIDS epidemic— much less the vulnerability of the United States to those terrorists, illegal immigrants, and welfare dependents who threaten the freedom, health, and economic strength of the nation. That this dichotomy is not simply a false one, but in fact an imposition of power, and indeed the enabling condition of politics itself, suggests that Edelman has a clearly revolutionary analysis. Edelman's declaration that he is going beyond the politics of opposition by embracing its constitutive outside and declaring it his home is also Nietzsche's position, and it is, I think, the only possible meaning we can ascribe to the word "queer." As Edelman says, "Queerness can never define an identity; it can only ever disturb one." 123 But Edelman and Marxist critics alike would be wrong to ascribe to this perpetual resistance an apolitical character—or instead, as Puar warns, as itself a normative idealization of resistance in an implicitly voluntarist model of agency. 124 For queer is contradiction, the both/and, the refusal to be singularly determinate: in the case of gender and sexuality in particular, it is the refusal of the will to truth precisely in the realms of life believed to be the most natural, the most immune to "deconstruction"—the body, its desire, and its sex. That this in-between position, this both/and continues to be the space of the abject and the unthinkable, the futurelessness of desire with no telos and the death of civilization—refugees and other stateless people also raise these fundamental, discomfiting dilemmas—suggests that for revolution to remain revolutionary it must queer itself. It cannot remain wedded to a particular domain of truth or materiality as the foundation for the future, for this is itself a violation of its own radical credentials. Nor can it any longer hope for a salvific future wherein all corruption and dissatisfaction have been eliminated. This is quite different from either the dogmatic moralizing of revolutionaries past or the valorization of resistance as the only appropriate mode of subjectivity. Rather, it is not so far from what Puar recommends we adopt in thinking through the consequences of queer politics—allowing for "complicities" with power that do not signal "the failure of the radical, resistant, or oppositional potential of queernesses."'25 This means that both Nietzsche's revolution and his revolutionary posturing are positions of no future. Or, rather, that queered revolutionary commitment stakes its future on the eradication of the past, not its preservation. It is a position built not on the foundation of the Child, but on the ground of the graveyard. But it is also not a refusal of hope, as Edelman suggests, nor is it a tacitly Christian incitement of a revolutionary desire that cannot, and ought not, go ungratified, as Brown proposes. It is rather a recognition that hope is contradictorily compatible with death, with the insistent presentism of revolutionary commitment and futureless gratification of affirmation (or the futureless affirmation of gratification). Which concludes this book almost exactly where it started: for Nietzsche, our only choices are revolution or death, as Christianity poses the greatest threat to human existence thus far dreamed up. I think it is clear he wanted us to choose revolution, but I think it is also clear that he knew the choice was a setup—like all dichotomies, false.

### Coop

#### Countries consent to US drone activity

Foust and Boyle 2012 (Joshua Foust and Ashley S. Boyle, writers for the American Security project. The Strategic Context of Lethal Drones, A framework for discussion, August 16 , 2012, <http://www.scribd.com/doc/102744195/The-Strategic-Context-of-Lethal-Drones>, bs)

Criticisms of US drone programs frequently center on questions of legality. Despite claiming the strikes are legally permissible, Administration officials have not yet directly cited any law in justifying the use of drones in extraterritorial targeted killings.¶ 12¶ Critics argue that this failure to provide legal justification implicates the US in violating international legal frameworks on interstate force and national sovereignty.¶ 13¶ Furthermore, critics claim that US drone programs in Pakistan, Somalia, and Yemen set a dangerous precedent that could lead to any nation with strike-capable drones employing similar tactics in a “global drone war.”¶ 14¶ While laws governing the use of interstate force bar the use of force in another nation’s territory during times of peace, under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, a state has “the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense [sic]” until the UN Security Council takes action. The UN Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions has affrmed that Article 51 applies if either the targeted state agrees to the use of force in its territory by another nation, or the targeted state or a group operating within its territory, was responsible for an act of aggression against the targeting state.¶ 16¶ Only one of these conditions must be satisfied to justify a unilateral extraterritorial use of force by a UN Member. In the cases of Pakistan, Somalia, and Yemen,both conditions are satisfied: all three countries have consented, explicitly or otherwise, to the US operating drones within their territories, and all three are “safe havens” for groups that have launched violent attacks against the US and US interests. Therefore, while the US does not explicitly invoke Article 51, it is operating within its bounds under the international framework established by the UN – making any legal argument against drone programs challenging. In Afghanistan, Iraq, and Libya, the US was already engaged in combat operations. The legal questions regarding the use of lethal drones do not apply to these conflicts.

#### Legislative and Judicial checks on the executive prevent effective responses to nuclear terrorism and prolif

Li 2009 (ZHEYAO LI, J.D. candidate, Georgetown University Law Center, 2009; B.A., political science and history, Yale University, Winter, 2009¶ The Georgetown Journal of Law Public Policy¶ 7 Geo. J.L. & Pub. Pol'y 373, lexis, bs)

Another tenet of the Congressionalist position is "balanced institutional participation in foreign affairs." n25 Professor Koh, for example, advocates the implementation of a national security charter to reflect what he sees as the needed restoration of the separation and balance of powers between all three branches of government. This charter would be "[c]onsistent with the guiding principle of balanced institutional participation," prescribing a foreign affairs decision-making apparatus in which all three branches play important roles: "in a Congress that enacts a framework statute defining institutional responsibilities in foreign affairs; in a president who helps draft and apply the statute; and in courts who construe the charter and draw boundaries between lawful and unlawful conduct." n26 One of the most troubling features of Professor Koh's proposal is the involvement of the judicial branch.¶ Professor Koh fails to adequately discuss the objection that judicial intervention in the formulation of foreign policy would constitute an inherently political act. For, indeed, as Carl von Clausewitz once wrote, "[w]ar is merely the continuation of policy by other means" and "[w]hen whole communities go to war--whole peoples, and especially civilized peoples--the reason always lies in some political situation, and the occasion is always due to some political object." n27 Thus, to call for judicial review of the constitutionality or even [\*380] statutory legality of war actions is to invite judicial second-guessing in the policymaking motivations and processes of the political branches, and to weigh the wisdom of the legislature against the wisdom of the executive. A federal district court in Massachusetts was conscious of this exact problem when confronted, in a suit filed by six members of Congress, with the issue of whether President George W. Bush legally used force in committing troops to Iraq in 2003. The court ruled that, "[a]bsent a clear abdication of this constitutional responsibility by the political branches, the judiciary has no role to play." n28 The district court's holding was subsequently affirmed by the First Circuit on appeal, and the plaintiffs refrained from petitioning the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari. n29¶ Another shortcoming of Professor Koh's proposal to introduce new institutional checks and balances on the war powers through statutory enactment is revealed when he quotes, but quickly dismisses, the concerns of Professor Paul Kennedy, who wrote even before the end of the Cold War that the United States¶ "may not always be assisted by its division of constitutional and decision-making powers, deliberately created when it was geographically and strategically isolated from the rest of the world two centuries ago . . . but which may be harder to operate when it has become a global superpower, often called upon to make swift decisions vis-a-vis countries which enjoy far fewer constraints." n30¶ While Koh is absolutely correct when he argues that, simply because other nation-states might not abide by the same constitutional or democratic constraints, that does not entitle America to freely disregard her own Constitution, n31 this tautology does not provide a satisfactory conclusion to the inquiry, especially when American lives are at stake.¶ Specifically, Professor Koh fails to foresee the unique problems presented by the rise of non-state actors, particularly terrorist groups. He writes that "[e]xpecting, perhaps, a response to a nuclear strike, the occasions are exceedingly rare when the president would jeopardize the nation by considering legality before committing the nation to a course of international action." n32 This statement is true when considered solely in the context of non-nuclear, state-based threats. In the modern age of international terrorism and rogue states, however, considering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the ease and low cost with which WMDs may be deployed, the President may not have the luxury to [\*381] wait on congressional debate and approval before acting to prevent the loss of American lives.

#### NATO resilient

Saideman ’13 Stephen M. Saideman, “NATO Demise Redux?” New Atlanticist, 1/28/2013, http://www.acus.org/new\_atlanticist/nato-demise-redux

Harlan Ullman’s “NATO RIP” seemed like a bit of déjà vu, as people have been predicting the Alliance’s demise pretty much as long as it has been around. This obviously increased after the Soviet Union collapsed and with it NATO’s raison d’etre. However, the reality is that institutions are sticky, including international ones, and disappear less often and less easily than people aver. Here, I consider why NATO, like other institutions endures and then focus on the role of NATO lately and into the future even after President Obama’s “pivot” to Asia. Institutions manage to stick around for a variety of reasons. Primarily, they represent old bargains that retain some value and that would be risky to re-visit. NATO is a piece of work. That is, it represents decades of negotiations, compromises, and cooperation that have much value. Starting anew would toss away all the sunk costs and might not lead to something better. While NATO is hardly perfect, the level of interoperability provides significant value over ad hoc coalitions. Indeed, the ad hoc coalitions that do form tend to be built on NATO relationships and processes, including the coalition of the willing that went into Iraq in 2003, the air campaign over Libya before it became a NATO operation, and now the effort to help France in Mali. NATO is not an accident but the product of the combined interests of its members. While those interests have evolved, the members still have an interest in the security that NATO provides, as the deployment of American, Dutch, and German defense systems to Turkey currently demonstrates. The security guarantees are not just of interest to the East European countries, as averred by Ullman, as Denmark and Norway remain concerned about Russia. France historically worked against NATO and sought other institutions as substitutes, but recently re-dedicated itself to the Alliance, including altering where it operated in Afghanistan at great cost. NATO has over the past twenty years repeatedly proved to be superior militarily to the alternatives. Neither the European Union nor the United Nations were able to deal adequately with violence as Yugoslavia fell apart. NATO’s intervention in Bosnia has led to an enduring if imperfect peace. While one can argue about Kosovo, NATO held together long enough to force Milosevic to give in precisely because members decided that the alliance itself was at stake. While Afghanistan is not a huge success story and one could write books about the challenges of caveats in that effort (see Auerswald and Saideman, NATO and Afghanistan, in late 2013), countries were willing to sacrifice a tremendous amount, in terms of lives lost and budgets spent, on a place that really did not matter to them. Why? Because they were investing in the future of NATO and in their alliances with the United States. While sunk costs are not a smart way to think about investments, they matter in politics. So countries now have a greater incentive to support NATO in the future because they bled for the NATO cause in the past. If the concern is about the United States and Obama’s interest in the Alliance, one should focus on behavior rather than the omissions of experts at a think tank. When the Libyan effort started, France was passionate enough about the operation that it was more than willing to forgo NATO, but Obama insisted that the mission be a NATO one. This was, in part, about burden-sharing—the US did not want to do most of the heavy lifting—but it was also about the learned lessons of Iraq. Multilateral military efforts have more legitimacy when they are performed by respected international institutions, and NATO clearly is that.

### Blowback

#### Empirics prove no Indo-Pak escalation

Thakur 11 (Chandra, Distinguished Fellow, Centre for International Governance Innovation and Professor of Political Science, University of Waterloo, Glendon School of Public and International Affairs, Global Brief February 18th 2011, www98.griffith.edu.au/dspace/handle/10072/51641, page 2)

Islamabad’s record of double-dealing, deceit and denial of Pakistan-based attacks, in Afghanistan and India alike, has been based on four degrees of separation – between the government, the army, the ISI and terrorists – the plausibility of which is fading as it is exploited as a convenient alibi to escape accountability. That Pakistanis in general might harbour goodwill and friendships toward India is irrelevant if they have little say in making policy. Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh – by instinct circumspect – has said that, “given the sophistication and military precision,” the Mumbai attacks “must have had the support of some official agencies in Pakistan.” The combination of training, selection and advance reconnaissance of targets, diversionary tactics, discipline, munitions, cryptographic communications, false IDs, and damage inflicted is more typically associated with special forces units than with terrorists.

#### Civil war won’t escalate

Cook et al 7

Steven A. Cook (fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations) Ray Takeyh (fellows at the Council on Foreign Relations) and Suzanne Maloney (senior fellow at Saban Center) June 28 2007 “Why the Iraq war won't engulf the Mideast”, International Herald Tribune

Finally, **there is no precedent for Arab leaders to commit forces to conflicts in which they are not directly involved**. The Iraqis and the Saudis did send small contingents to fight the Israelis in 1948 and 1967, but they were either ineffective or never made it. In the 1970s and 1980s, **Arab countries** other than Syria, which had a compelling interest in establishing its hegemony over Lebanon, **never committedforces either to protect the Lebanese from the Israelis or from other Lebanese. The civil war in Lebanon was regarded as someone else's fight**. Indeed, this is the way many leaders view the current situation in Iraq. To Cairo, Amman and Riyadh, the situation in Iraq is worrisome, but in the end it is an Iraqi and American fight. As far as Iranian mullahs are concerned, they have long preferred to press their interests through proxies as opposed to direct engagement. At a time when Tehran has access and influence over powerful Shiite militias, a massive cross-border incursion is both unlikely and unnecessary. So Iraqis will remain locked in a sectarian and ethnic struggle that outside powers may abet, but will remain within the borders of Iraq. **The Middle East is a region** both prone and **accustomed to civil wars. But given its experience with ambiguous conflicts, the region has also developed an intuitive ability to contain its civil strife and prevent local conflicts from enveloping the entire Middle East**.

### CMR

#### No relationship between US capabilities and peace

Fettweis 10 – Professor of national security affairs @ U.S. Naval War College. [Christopher J. Fettweis, “Threat and Anxiety in US Foreign Policy,”  Survival, Volume 52,

Issue 2 April 2010 , pages 59 – 82//informaworld]

**One potential explanation for the growth of global peace can be dismissed fairly quickly: US actions do not seem to have contributed much**. **The** limited **ev**idence **suggests that there is little reason to believe in the stabilising power of the US hegemon, and that there is no relation between the relative level of American activism and international stability. During the** 19**90s, the U**nited **S**tates **cut back on its defence spending fairly substantially**. By 1998, the United States was spending $100 billion less on defence in real terms than it had in 1990, a 25% reduction.29 To internationalists, defence hawks and other believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible 'peace dividend' endangered both national and global security. 'No serious analyst of American military capabilities', argued neo-conservatives William Kristol and Robert Kagan in 1996, 'doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America's responsibilities to itself and to world peace'.30 And yet the verdict from the 1990s is fairly plain**: the world grew more peaceful while the U**nited **S**tates **cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable US military,** or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief. **No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums; no security dilemmas drove insecurity or arms races; no regional balancing occurred once the stabilis-ing presence of the US military was diminished. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international war was not a pressing concern**, **despite the reduction in US military capabilities. Most of all, the U**nited **S**tates **was no less safe. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the U**nited **S**tates **cut its military spending** under President Bill Clinton, and kept declining as the George W. Bush administration ramped the spending back up. **Complex statistical analysis is unnecessary to reach the conclusion that world peace and US military expenditure are unrelated.**

## 2NC—Objectivism

### 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.

### 2NC—Link Top Level

#### Terrorism is rooted in a hatred of reason—the alternative is key to ME stability

Hudgins, 13

(Edward Hudgins writes on political and social issues. “September 11 And The Need For Enlightenment” <http://www.atlassociety.org/ele/blog/2013/09/10/september-11-and-need-enlightenment>) Henge

September 10, 2013 — Twelve years after the attacks on America by Islamist mass murderers, mass murder proceeds apace in the Muslim Middle East. Unfortunately, the real nature of the bloodshed still eludes many American policymakers and the public as well. The dictators Consider the three forces that have been involved in that region for decades. First, there are the traditional dictators: the now-dead Saddam Hussein in Iraq, the now-deposed Hosni Mubarak in Egypt, and the always-despised Bashar al-Assad in Syria. Their corrupt, brutal regimes have been relatively secular because they haven’t wanted challenges to their power; to the extent they’ve used religion, it has been to keep the masses in line. But in this region there have never been the values, culture, institutions, and practices of a free, open society. It’s always been kings and strongmen ruling servile subjects. The Islamists Second, there are the theocrats: the Muslim Brotherhood, the Taliban, al Qaeda, Hamas, Hezbollah, the ayatollahs, and the mullahs. They are the medievalists, the pre-moderns, infused with the ideology of Islam, with the goal of even more repressive and brutal dictatorships under Sharia law. Americans are wrong to imagine that the Islamists and their program, which brought down the World Trade Center towers twelve years ago, are simply blowback for real or imagined recent U.S. government foreign policy slights. The Muslim Brotherhood was founded in 1928 by Hassan al-Banna, who hated everything modern. Its slogan: “Jihad is our way; and dying in the way of Allah is the highest of our aspirations.” Its goal: to make the savage past the future. Islamism is a virulent ideology just like Communism and Fascism and its acolytes are not motivated by traditional geopolitical logic. Everyone else And third, there is everyone else. There are the masses in Egypt who were frustrated by poverty, lack of economic opportunity, and political corruption of dictatorship. They helped overthrow Mubarak and then, facing Islamic repression, helped overthrow the Muslim Brotherhood, hoping that the new military dictatorship might be better than the old one. There are the masses in Syria who were frustrated by poverty, lack of economic opportunity, and political corruption. They rose against Assad and 100,000 of them have been slaughtered. Sadly, their ranks are becoming dominated by Islamists. So the Syrian civil war now pits a traditional dictator against the partisans of theocracy. It’s a no-win situation. The need for Enlightenment What is clearly needed and clearly lacking in the Muslim Middle East are strong voices for Enlightenment, modernist values: a respect for human reason as opposed to blind faith; individual liberty and autonomy; free markets; and honest governments limited to protecting life, liberty, and property. Those voices might come from Muslims in the West. But too few do. Since the 9/11 attacks, there have been no masses of American Muslims in the streets of American cities denouncing Islamists and making the promotion of Enlightenment values among their coreligionists Job One. Europe is worse. When a Danish paper in 2005 published cartoons of Mohammed, thousands took to the streets of European cities demanding death to the infidels. Increasing numbers of Muslims choose to live in the West and enjoy what life there offers. But the vast majority of them fail to uphold the values on which the West is based. The Muslim Middle East is going through a wrenching transformation from pre-modern to modern, a process that took many bloody centuries in Western Europe. What it needs most desperately are strong advocates for the philosophy of reason and freedom that underlies the modern world.

#### 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.

### Impact Top Level

#### 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. § Marked 14:50 § 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.

## 2NC—Coop

### 2NC—Prolif O/W

#### Highest magnitude—no checks on escalation

Taylor 1 (Theodore, Chairman of NOVA, Former Nuclear Weapons Designer, 2001, http://www-ee.stanford.edu/~hellman/Breakthrough/book/chapters/taylor.html)

Nuclear proliferation - be it among nations or terrorists - greatly increases the chance of nuclear violence on a scale that would be intolerable. Proliferation increases the chance that nuclear weapons will fall into the hands of irrational people, either suicidal or with no concern for the fate of the world. Irrational or outright psychotic leaders of military factions or terrorist groups might decide to use a few nuclear weapons under their control to stimulate a global nuclear war, as an act of vengeance against humanity as a whole. Countless scenarios of this type can be constructed. Limited nuclear wars between countries with small numbers of nuclear weapons could escalate into major nuclear wars between superpowers. For example, a nation in an advanced stage of "latent proliferation," finding itself losing a nonnuclear war, might complete the transition to deliverable nuclear weapons and, in desperation, use them. If that should happen in a region, such as the Middle East, where major superpower interests are at stake, the small nuclear war could easily escalate into a global nuclear war.

## 2NC—Blowback

### AT: ME War

#### Can’t escalate—empirics and deterrence checks

Ferguson ‘6 (Niall, Professor of History at Harvard University, Senior Research Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford, and Senior Fellow of the Hoover Institution, Stanford, LA Times, July 24)

Could today's quarrel between Israelis and Hezbollah over Lebanon produce World War III? That's what Republican Newt Gingrich, the former speaker of the House, called it last week, echoing earlier fighting talk by Dan Gillerman, Israel's ambassador to the United Nations. Such language can — for now, at least — safely be dismissed as hyperbole. This crisis is not going to trigger another world war. Indeed, I do not expect it to produce even another Middle East war worthy of comparison with those of June 1967 or October 1973. In 1967, Israel fought four of its Arab neighbors — Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Iraq. In 1973, Egypt and Syria attacked Israel. Such combinations are very hard to imagine today. Nor does it seem likely that Syria and Iran will escalate their involvement in the crisis beyond continuing their support for Hezbollah. Neither is in a position to risk a full-scale military confrontation with Israel, given the risk that this might precipitate an American military reaction. Crucially, Washington's consistent support for Israel is not matched by any great power support for Israel's neighbors. During the Cold War, by contrast, the risk was that a Middle East war could spill over into a superpower conflict. Henry Kissinger, secretary of State in the twilight of the Nixon presidency, first heard the news of an Arab-Israeli war at 6:15 a.m. on Oct. 6, 1973. Half an hour later, he was on the phone to the Soviet ambassador in Washington, Anatoly Dobrynin. Two weeks later, Kissinger flew to Moscow to meet the Soviet leader, Leonid Brezhnev. The stakes were high indeed. At one point during the 1973 crisis, as Brezhnev vainly tried to resist Kissinger's efforts to squeeze him out of the diplomatic loop, the White House issued DEFCON 3, putting American strategic nuclear forces on high alert. It is hard to imagine anything like that today. In any case, this war may soon be over. Most wars Israel has fought have been short, lasting a matter of days or weeks (six days in '67, three weeks in '73). Some Israeli sources say this one could be finished in a matter of days. That, at any rate, is clearly the assumption being made in Washington.

#### Escalation empirically denied

Drum ‘7 Kevin Drum, “The Chaos Hawk…” The Washington Monthly’s Political Animal Blog, 9/9/07, http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/archives/individual/2007\_09/012029.php

Needless to say, this is nonsense. Israel has fought war after war in the Middle East. Result: no regional conflagration. Iran and Iraq fought one of the bloodiest wars of the second half the 20th century. Result: no regional conflagration. The Soviets fought in Afghanistan and then withdrew. No regional conflagration. The U.S. fought the Gulf War and then left. No regional conflagration. Algeria fought an internal civil war for a decade. No regional conflagration.

## 2NC—CMR

### 2NC—Heg D

#### Their impacts are manufactured with no basis

Fettweis 10– Professor of national security affairs @ U.S. Naval War College. [Christopher J. Fettweis, “Threat and Anxiety in US Foreign Policy,”  Survival, Volume 52, Issue 2 April 2010 , pages 59 – 82//informaworld]

Today's security debate often seems to be driven less by actual threats than vague, unnamed dangers. Former Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld warned about 'unknown unknowns': the threats 'we don't know we don't know', which 'tend to be the difficult ones'.32 Kristol and Kagan worry that if the United States fails to remain highly engaged, the international system 'is likely to yield very real external dangers, as threatening in their own way as the Soviet Union was a quarter century ago'.33 What exactly these dangers are is left open to interpretation. In the absence of identifiable threats, the unknown can provide us with an enemy, one whose power is limited only by the imagination. This is what Benjamin Friedman and Harvey Sapolsky call 'the threat of no threats', and is perhaps the most frightening danger of all.34 Even if, as folk wisdom has it, anything is possible, not everything is plausible. Vague, generalised dangers should never be acceptable replacements for specific threats when crafting national policy. There is no limit to the potential dangers the human mind can manufacture, but there are very definite limits to the specific threats § Marked 14:01 § the world contains. 'To make anything very terrible, obscurity seems in general to be necessary', noted Edmund Burke. 'When we know the full extent of any danger, when we can accustom our eyes to it, a great deal of the apprehension vanishes.'35 The full extent of today's dangers is not only knowable, but relatively minor.

## 1NR—Edelman

### AT: Permutation

#### Radical Passivity Turn: The permutation’s call to action guts solvency – we must become radically passive, refusing to reform the system, which would only reproduce heteronormativity.

Wang 10 (Jackie, Writer, “Negative feminism, anti-social queer theory and the politics of hope,” <http://serbianballerinasdancewithmachineguns.com/post/724635724/negative-feminism-anti-social-queer-theory-and-the>, )

So I wouldn’t say that Jack’s theories don’t advocate doing nothing, rather, doing something through a refusal to do anything, a radical form of passivity. Similar, Jack notes that, “Negativity might well constitute an anti-politics but it should not register as apolitical.” A passive consumer who watches TV all day and drives an SUV to work wouldn’t be the same as, say, the narrator of Jamaica Kincaid’s Autobiography of my Mother, who refuses to be happy or do anything because she rejects the impetus to participate while she is forced to exist under colonialism. Jack writes that, “She opposes colonial rule precisely by refusing to accommodate herself to it or to be responsible for reproducing it in any way. Thus the autobiographical becomes an unwriting, an undoing, an unraveling of self.” While the narrator is resistant to the logic of production and participation, the strategy is—in a roundabout kind of way—a perverse form of productivity.

#### *\*\*Note about card: This evidence is an article evaluating Jack Halberstam’s reading of Edelman’s antisocial turn and radical passivity\*\**

### Impact Level

#### The social order will always project images of potential suffering and violence which necessitate positive actions to avoid catastrophes. Our foremost ethical duty is to challenge this forced choice: to take make the impossible decision and say yes to all their threats.

Edelman 04 (Lee, Prof @ Tuffman University, No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive, P. 108-9)

On the face of Mount Rushmore, as he faces the void to which he himself offers a face, Leonard gestures toward such an unbinding by committing himself to the sinthomosexual's impossible ethical act: by standing resolutely at, and on, and for that absolute limit. Alenka Zupan'dle, in Ethics of the Real, notes that what Kant called the ethical act "is denounced as `radically evil' in every ideology," and then describes how ideology typically manages to defend against it: "The gap opened by an act (i.e., the unfamiliar, 'out-of-place' effect of an act) is immediately linked in this ideological gesture to an image. As a rule this is an image of suffering, which is then displayed to the public alongside this question: Is this what you want? And this question already implies the answer: It would be impossible, inhuman, for you to want this!" 55 The image of suffering adduced here is always the threatened suffering of an image: an image onto which the face of the human has coercively been projected such that we, by virtue of losing it, must also lose the face by which we (think we) know ourselves. For "we are, in effect," as Lacan ventriloquizes the normative understanding of the self, "at one with everything that depends on the image of the other as our fellow man, on the similarity we have to our ego and to everything that situates us in the imaginary register." 56 To be anything else—to refuse the constraint, the inertia, of the ego as form— would be, as Zupana rightly says, "impossible, inhuman." As impossible and inhuman as a shivering beggar who asks that we kill him or fuck him; as impossible and inhuman as Leonard, who responds to Thornhill by crushing his hand; as impossible and inhuman as the sinthomosexual, who shatters the lure of the future and, for refusing the call to compassion, finally merits none himself. To embrace the impossibility, the inhumanity of the sinthomosexual: that, I suggest, is the ethical task for which queers are singled out. Leonard affords us no lesson in how to follow in his footsteps, but calls us, beyond desire, to a sinthomosexuality of our own—one we assume at the price of the very identity named by "our own." To those on whom his ethical stance, his act, exerts a compulsion, Leonard bequeaths the irony of trying to read him as an allegory, as one from whom we could learn how to act and in whom we could find the sinthomosexual's essential concretization: the formalization of a resistance to the constant conservation of forms, the substantialization of a negativity that dismantles every substance. He leaves us, in short, the impossible task of trying to fill his shoes—shoes that were empty of anything human even while he was wearing them, but that lead us, against our own self-interest and in spite of our own desire, toward a jouissance from which everything "human," to have one, must turn its face.

### AT: XTNCT Futurity impact

#### Queering requires giving up on utility in order to embrace the meaninglessness of all sexualities. Only disregarding utility allows us to challenge heteronormativity.

Giffney 08 (Noreen, Professor of Queer Theory at University College of Dublin, Queering the Non/Human, p. 68-9, )

Edelman’s appeal to forgo meaning, to scorn utility and occupy a space of unassimilable jouissance11 is, I maintain, in line with the thinking of Georges Bataille who rejects the notion of transgression because it often simply reifies the norm against which it acts: ‘There exists no prohibition that cannot be transgressed. Often the transgression is permitted, often it is even prescribed’ (1986/1957, 63). Instead, Bataille locates his analysis at the level of utility and thus productivity, what Shannon Winnubst calls ‘this fundamental logic of utility at the heart of sexuality’ (2007, 85). Bataille’s work concentrates on the way in which eroticism has been reduced through normalisation to sexuality in a similar way that Edelman, I propose, comments on the disciplining of sexuality by turning it into reproductive futurism. By figuring the death drive, queerness makes visible the uselessness of all sexualities, lays bare reproductive futurism as fantasy and while embodying the negativity that the social has conferred on it, refuses to facilitate its continuation. Winnubst writes of ‘the horror of uselessness’ which comes to signify what it means to be ‘properly human’ (85), setting out how queering should engage in ‘activities that are going nowhere’, ‘acts or pleasures that offer no clear or useful meaning’ (90, 91), in an effort to reconfigure the societal obsession with teleology. Edelman writes of the ‘inhumanity’ of the sinthomosexual (2004, 109) as a way of challenging the normalising strictures of the Human. Describing the sinthomosexual as ‘anti- Promethean’ (108) devoid of the desire for self-actualisation through object choice, Edelman offers, I believe, one way in which this ‘word without a future’ (33) queers the Human. This apocaloptic gesture – read here as a cathartic letting-go of the rules governing self-actualisation – puts pressure on the desire for recognition,12 on the very teleology of desire itself in the acceptance of the fact that recognition depends on the desire of another, one who in the case of reproductive futurism, may withhold at any time the ‘Humanising’ gaze from those marked out as Queer.