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### 1NC

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should restrict the President’s war power authority to murder as a first resort outside zones of active hostilities.

#### Targeted killing is a euphemism that sanitizes and bureaucratizes a policy of sovereign violence and permanent war

Healy 12

(Gene, VP of Cato Inst., "Drone-War Double-Think", http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/dronewar-doublethink)

“Political language,” George Orwell wrote in 1946, “is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable.” When government action can only be defended by arguments “too brutal for most people to face,” governments reliably brutalize the language, resorting to “euphemism, question-begging and sheer cloudy vagueness.”¶ The Bush administration introduced any number of such fuzz words to the political lexicon: “regime change,” “enhanced interrogation,” and “self-injurious behavior incidents” (Pentagon jargon for suicide attempts by Gitmo prisoners — sorry, “enemy combatants.”)¶ And who can forget the Obama national security team’s insistence last year that pounding Libya with Tomahawk missiles and Predator drone strikes wasn’t “war,” but rather, “kinetic military action?” (As opposed to “static” action?)¶ The Obama team has lately added a new term to the doublespeak lexicon, “the disposition matrix.” This soporific word-cloud replaces the admirably frank “kill or capture list.”¶ Killing or capturing terrorists with the means and the intent to kill Americans is eminently defensible, but a Washington Post investigative report published last week raises questions about whether bureaucratic “mission creep” has cut the program loose from its original justification. “Obama has institutionalized the highly classified practice of targeted killing,” the Post’s Greg Miller writes, “transforming ad-hoc elements into a counterterrorism infrastructure capable of sustaining a seemingly permanent war.” He reports “broad consensus” among Obama terror-warriors that “such operations are likely to be extended at least another decade.”

### 1NC

#### First, death is a predetermined inevitability that is futile to prevent. The aff’s fear of mortal finitude is the mark of non-believers. Instead, we must orient ourselves through a transcendent faith in God who gives both our lives and deaths meaning.

Yayha 13 [ Harun Yahya Turkish Islamic author; “Death Is Not the End”; <http://www.new-muslims.info/abcs-of-islam/articles-of-faith/death-is-not-the-end/?ModPagespeed=noscript> //BlackMagic]

Every self will taste death. We test you with both good and evil as a trial. And you will be returned to Us. (Al-Anbiyaa’ 21:35) Death, which is certain to happen to all of us, is a very important fact in one’s life. We can never know exactly what we will experience in an hour or even in the next moment. This being the case, it is obvious how wrong it would be to plan our lives based on events that may never happen. Death, on the other hand, is the only thing that is certain to happen. Only the recognition of this basic truth makes us understand that we must found our lives according to it. Death is also a part of the trial of man. God informs us in the Qur’an that He created death and life to try man: He Who created death and life to test which of you is best in action. He is the Almighty, the Ever-Forgiving. (Al-Mulk 67:2) Death is the end of merely the life of this world- thus the end of the trial- and the beginning of the next life. For this reason, believers have no fear of death. The thought of death does not distress them, because, every moment of their lives is spent in the pursuit of good deeds as preparation for the Hereafter. For unbelievers, however, fear causes them great distress, because they consider it a complete annihilation. Thus, they avoid the thought of death and they don’t even let that thought pass their minds and they escape from death. But it is futile. No soul can escape death when the predetermined time for it has come. This, in a verse, is stressed as follows: Wherever you are, death will catch up with you, even if you are in impregnable fortresses… (An-Nisaa’4:78) To avoid the thought of death is to avoid the truth. As death will eventually catch up with man sooner or later, it is wise to conduct oneself with a mind busy with the thought of death. This is the rational disposition by which believers abide. Until death comes upon them, they engage in good deeds, as Allah commands us in the Qur’an: And worship your Lord until what is Certain comes to you. (Al-Hijr 15:99)

#### And, the secularist framing of the aff collapses into relativism. It’s a disenchantment with nature, a desacralization of politics, and a deconsecration of values. Their immanent metaphysics renders all impacts meaningless.

Al-Attas 93 [Syed Muhammad Naquib Al-Attas; a prominent contemporary Muslim philosopher and thinker from Malaysia; M.A. degree with distinction in Islamic philosophy in 1962, Ph.D School of Oriental and African Studies @ University of London: Founder of International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilization and University Professor of Islamic Thought and Civilization; “islam and Secularism”// BlackMagic]

Secularization is defined as the deliverance of man ‘first from religious and then from metaphysical control over his reason and his language. It is “the loosing of the world from religious and quasi-religious understandings of itself, the dispelling of all closed world views, the breaking of all supernatural myths and sacred symbols... the de-fatalization of history’, the discovery by man that he has been left with the world on his hands, that he can no longer blame fortune or the furies for what he does with it…; [it is] man turning his attention away from the worlds beyond and toward this world and this time." Secularization encompasses not only the political and social aspects of life, but also inevitably the cultural, for it denotes “the disappearance of religious determination of the symbols of cultural integration”. It implies “a historical process, almost certainly irreversible, in which society and culture are delivered from tutelage to religious control and closed metaphysical world views”. It is a “liberating development”, and the end product of secularization is historical relativism)’ Hence according to them history is a process of secularization. The integral components in the dimensions of secularization are the disenchantment of nature, the desacralization of politics, and the deconsecration of values. By the ‘disenchantment’ of nature — a term and concept borrowed from the German sociologist Max Weber — they mean as he means, the freeing of nature from its religious overtones; and this involves the dispelling of animistic spirits and gods and magic from the natural world, separating it from God and distinguishing man from it, so that man may no longer regard nature as a divine entity, which thus allows him to act freely upon nature, to make use of it according to his needs and plans, and hence create historical change and ‘development’. By the ‘desacralization’ of politics they mean the abolition of sacral legitimation of political power and authority, which is the prerequisite of political change and hence also social change allowing for the emergence of the historical process. By the ‘deconsecration’ of values they mean the rendering transient and relative all cultural creations and every value system which for them includes religion and worldviews having ultimate and final significance, so that in this way history, the future, is open to change, and man is free to create the change and immerse himself in the ‘evolutionary’ process. This attitude towards values demands an awareness on the part of secular man of the relativity of his own views and beliefs; he must live with the realization that the rules and ethical codes of conduct which guide his own life will change with the times and generations. This attitude demands what they call ‘maturity’, and hence secularization is also a process of ‘evolution’ of the consciousness of man from the ‘infantile’ to the ‘mature’ states, and is defined as “the removal of juvenile dependence from every level of society..., the process of maturing and assuming responsibility..., the removal of religious and metaphysical supports and putting man on his own”. They say that this change of values is also the recurrent phenomenon of “conversion” which occurs “at the intersection of the action of history on man and the action of man on history”, which they call “responsibility, the acceptance of adult accountability”. Now we must take due notice of the fact that they make a distinction between secularization and secularism, saying that whereas the former implies a continuing and open-ended process in which values and worldviews are continually revised in accordance with ‘evolutionary’ change in history, the latter, like religion, projects a closed worldview and an absolute set of values in line with an ultimate historical purpose having a final significance for man. Secularism according to them denotes an ideology. Whereas the ideology that is secularism, like the process that is secularization, also disenchants nature and desacralizes politics, it never quite deconsecrates values since it sets up its own system of values intending it to be regarded as absolute and final, unlike secularization which relativizes all values and produces the openness and freedom necessary for human action and for history. For this reason they regard secularism as a menace to secularization, and urge that it must be vigilantly watched and checked and prevented from becoming the ideology of the state. Secularization, they think, describes the inner workings of man’s ‘evolution’, The context in which secularization occurs is the urban civilization. The structure of common life, they believe, has evolved’ from the primitive to the tribal to the village to the town to the city by stages — from the simple social groupings to the complex mass society; and in die state of human life, or the stage of man’s ‘evolution’, this corresponds to the ‘development’ of man from the ‘infantile’ to the ‘mature’ states. The urban civilization is the context in which the state of man’s maturing’ is taking place; the context in which secularization takes place, patterning the form of the civilization as well as being patterned by it. The definition of secularization which describes its true nature to our understanding corresponds exactly with what is going on in the spiritual and intellectual and rational and physical and material life of Western man and his culture and civilization; and it is true only when applied to describe the nature and existential condition of Western culture and civilization. The claim that secularization has its roots in biblical faith and that it is the fruit of the Gospel has no substance in historical fact. Secularization has its roots not in biblical faith, but in the interpretation of biblical faith by Western man; it is not the fruit of the Gospel, but is the fruit of the long history of philosophical and metaphysical conflict in the religious and purely rationalistic worldview of Western man. The interdependence of the interpretation and the worldview operates in history and is seen as a ‘development’; indeed it has been SO logically in history because for Western man the truth, or God Himself, has become incarnate in man in time and in history.

#### And, secularism is responsible for the most vicious forms of statist oppression.

Sayyid 04 [Bobby S. Sayyid is a Lecturer in Sociology, University of Salford, Manchester. He has previously taught at the Universities of East London, Manchester and Salford; “A Fundamental Fear: Eurocentrism and the Emergence of Islamism”;//BlackMagic]

Failure of nationalist secular elites. For Fouad Ajami this failure owes much to the manner in which the post-colonial elites aligned themselves with modernity and the West, and came to despise their own people for being backward. For Fischer, this is one of the main factors behind the rise of militant Islam. Fischer argues that Islamism is a reaction to the failure of the 'naive liberalism' of the 1930s and Third World socialism in the 1960s and 1970s. The emergence of Islamism is presented as a product of the inability of the secular elites, which succeeded the European colonial regimes, to meet the hopes and aspirations of their people. Lack of political participation53 The expansion of the state, both territorially and infrastructurally, makes it difficult for population groups to escape the state. When the infrastructural long arm of the post-colonial state is combined with the heavy-handed despotism of Muslim societies, the result is the erosion of civil society - that is, the authoritarian nature of post-colonial regimes resulted in all legitimate public spaces being restricted. Michael Gilsenan gives three reasons for the authoritarianism of the post-colonial regimes: first, the personalist nature of the new regimes; second, the expansion of civilian and military disciplinary techniques which came with independence, leading to the 'systematic and unpredictable' intrusion into people's lives;55 and third, the dis­ crepancies between the ideologies of nationalism and legitimacy on the one hand, and the realities of social inequalities and foreign dependence on the other. A consequence of this expansive authori­ tarianism is that the mosque emerged as the only arena of public discourse that the state did not fully monopolize. 56 Ajami also argues that the lack of public participation in the political process was a major factor in leading to the politicization of the mosque.57 Theda Skocpol uses a similar argument in her study of the Iranian revolution; she emphasizes the role of the institutional networks of the Shia Ulema in escaping the Pahlavi dictatorship's control and thus becoming instrumental in the overthrow of the Peacock Throne.58 The emergence of the mosque as the only viable public space politicizes the religious vocabulary as it is increasingly used to des­ cribe political problems. It also leads to an increase in the use of religious idioms in making political protests. The absence of demo­ cracy and the domestication of spaces where the state could not previously reach (the desert, the mountains), disrupts the previous balance between state and civil society, forcing elements to combine in their opposition to the state's expansion. This combination of elements is possible only on the basis of the widest institutional ensemble that remains semi-autonomous from the state - the mosque.

#### The alternative is an Islamization of our epistemology.

#### That alternative is mutually exclusive with the secularism of the aff. Only Islamization can solve the immanent devaluation of life.

Al-Attas 93 [Syed Muhammad Naquib Al-Attas; a prominent contemporary Muslim philosopher and thinker from Malaysia; M.A. degree with distinction in Islamic philosophy in 1962, Ph.D School of Oriental and African Studies @ University of London: Founder of International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilization and University Professor of Islamic Thought and Civilization; “islam and Secularism”// BlackMagic]

 Socialism is a separate, secular ideology, and there can never be such a reality as Islamic Socialism’ or Socialism in Islam’. if they desire and intend to convey the idea that certain integral components in the dimensions of socialism are parallel with or similar to those in the dimensions of Islam, then they should express the idea in other ways not susceptible of an ambiguous interpretation such as, for example, ‘the social, political, and economic dimensions of Islam’— or some other such expressions which could, with a modicum of intellectual effort, be very easily conceived and regarded and accepted as a valid interpretation of the Islamic worldview. But their failure to understand this, and their determination to write as they did, betrays clearly their lack of true familiarity with and depth of knowledge of either or both Islam and Western culture and civilization. And as such they constitute a continuing threat to the Muslim Community in its welfare and right guidance. So then in the same way that there can never be an ‘Islamic Socialism’, so there can never really be an Islamic Secularism’; and secularization can never really be a part of Islam. Hence those integral components whose historical and cultural effect in the West pertain to the dimensions of secularization, and which are not necessarily the monopoly of Western culture and civilization because they also play an important historical and cultural role in the impact of Islam in human history and culture, should simply be interpreted in their proper Islamic perspective as the integral components in the dimensions of islamization. Islamization is the liberation of man first from magical, mythological, animistic, national—cultural tradition opposed to Islam, and then from secular control over his reason and his language. The person of Islam is he whose reason and language are no longer controlled by magic, mythology, animism, his own national and cultural traditions opposed to Islam, and secularism. He is liberated from both the magical and the secular world views. We have defined the nature of islamization as a liberating process. It is liberating because since man is both physical being and spirit, the liberation refers to his spirit, for man as such is the real man to whom all conscious and significant actions ultimately refer. The liberation of his spirit or soul bears direct influence upon his physical being or body in that it brings about peace and harmony within himself in his manifestation as a human being, and also between him as such and nature. He has, in liberation in this sense, set his course towards attainment to his original state, which is in harmony with the state of all being and existence (i.e. fitrah). It is also liberation from subservience to his physical demands which incline toward the secular and injustice to his true self or soul, for man as physical being inclines towards forgetfulness of his true nature, becoming ignorant of his true purpose and unjust to it. Islamization is a process not so much of evolution as that of devolution to original nature; man as spirit is already perfect, but man as such when actualized as physical being is subject to forgetfulness and ignorance amid injustice to himself and hence is not necessarily perfect. His ‘evolution’ towards perfection is his progress towards realization of his original nature as spirit. Thus in the individual, personal, existential sense islamization refers to what is described above in which the Holy Prophet represents the highest and most perfect Example; in the collective, social and historical sense islamization refers to the Community’s striving towards realization of the moral and ethical quality of social perfection achieved during the age of time Holy Prophet (may God bless and give him Peace!) who created it under Divine Guidance. We have also defined islamization as involving first time islamization of language, and this fact is demonstrated by the Holy Qur’an itself when it was first revealed among the Arabs. Language, thought and reason are closely interconnected and are indeed interdependent in projecting to man his worldview or vision of reality. Thus the islamization of language brings about the islamization of thought amid reason, not in the secular sense, but in the sense we have described. 3’ The islamization of Arabic by being charged with Divine inspiration in the form of Revelation transformed the place of Arabic among the languages of mankind to become the only divinely inspired living language and is in that sense ‘new’ arid perfected to the superlative degree so that it—especially its basic Islamic vocabulary—is not subject to change and development nor governed by the vicissitudes of social change as in the case of all other languages which derive from culture and tradition. The elevation of Arabic as the language in which God revealed the Holy Qur’ãn to mankind caused the language as no other to be preserved unchanged and alive and to remain perpetually as the exalted standard of Arabic, as the linguistic criterion in every respect, exhibiting its highest and most excellent expression. With regard to meaning pertaining to Islam, therefore, every such meaning is governed by the semantic vocabulary of the Holy Qur’an and not by social change, so that adequate knowledge about Islam is made possible for all at all times and generations, since such knowledge including its ethical, axiological, aesthetical and logical norms is already an established matter, and not one that evolves’ and ‘develops’ as man and history allegedly ‘evolve’ and ‘develop’. If there occurs then a sense of inadequacy about Islam and its relevance to changing situations, this illusory sense in reality occurs not because Islam is inadequate or irrelevant, but because the sense of inadequacy and irrelevance arises simply due to forgetfulness (nisyan) causing ignorance (jahl) which can be remedied by learning and remembrance. Ignorance causes confusion (zulm), and ignorance and confusion are the results of deislamization, which does occur among Muslims in history. De-islamization is the infusion of alien concepts into the minds of Muslims, where they remain and influence thought and reasoning. It is the causing of forgetfulness of Islam and of the Muslim’s duty to God and to His Prophet, which is the real duty assigned to his true self; and hence it is also injustice (zulm) to the self, it is tenacious adherence to pre-Islamic beliefs and superstitions, and obstinate pride and ideologization of one’s own pre-Islamic cultural traditions; or it is also secularization.

### 1NC—Terrorism

#### They affirm a Eurocentric notion of terrorism is one that posits all non-whites as demons—this creates threats that never existed

Itwaru 09 (Arnold, psychotherapist, educator, and editorial consultant on the project named Researching Caribbean Teaching and Learning at the [University of the West Indies,](http://www.mona.uwi.edu/)  Jamaica “Master Race, Murder and Gory Globalization” in The White Supremacist State: Eurocentrism, Imperialism, Colonialism, Racism Arnold H. Itwaru, ed. 2009 p. 25-79 deven)

This is demonological racism, It feeds off the Eurocentric belief in the demonology of evil, the fear of the demonic forces of the Devil which must be conquered by the forces of light and rightness - which, of course, the White liberal democracies of the West righteously think they are. The belief in primal demonic threats breeds a terrifying fear which will only be ameliorated by the destruction of those who are perceived as the threatening demonic hordes. This has been the reaction- ~ ~formation repeatedly, executed, to justify violent aggression , invasion, and occupation. It attaches to the morbid genocidal racism implicit in the very desire for supremacy. The White supremacist West has historically primitivized most of the peoples in the world. These historical perception persists in many ways today. These primitivized peoples who have ~en '~ smeared by the inferiority upon which Western supremacy .i prevails, are still not seen as the human beings they are. IniJ the terror-driven racist imaginary they are always suspect. The taint of the subhuman, the prehistoric, the savage, the uncivilized, the primitive, the heathen has been cast upon them. This is so much so that their very embodied presence has been construed as the visible sign of the evil they are said to possess. These "demons," it is believed, will pounce on the pure and innocent and well-meaning European (invader) whose only interest is to "help" these primitive godless ingrates. In demonological racism Europeans and their progeny are always pure and innocent and well-meaning and godfearing while the racialized Other are vile and unimaginably dangerous. Western imperialism has been fattened on the blood and body of the hundreds of millions of people slaughtered in demonological racist hunter-gatherer forays romanticized as "wars" when no one was warring with them. The demonic fabrication of ongoing threat has been institutionalized as a continuing and ever growing danger against which the warring West has to always prevail if it going to survive as the supreme exploiter of the world. It needs to keep inventing threats which it has to eliminate by murderous conquests if it is to maintain the myth of its own superiority as well as catering to its self indulgent conceits. The threat this time it stridently and ominously declares, is from an abstraction called "terrorism" which is directed against all of the West, and these demonic forces must be taught a lesson they will never forget. This has been the repeated ploy used to justifY the gory historical deeds of the acclaimed "Superior" races assaulting, plundering and murdering the imputed "inferior." This fabrication, at one level, is the paranoic confabulation which is generic to demonological racism. Paranoic confabulation is the invention of a threat where no threat exists and proceeding to act as if the threat is actually real. But we are not dealing here with the irrationalities of a disturbed mind. We are dealing with a disturbing ethnocentric institutionalized cultural proftle of shared beliefs, values and practices which justify the atrocities of murderous aggression for expanding Western supremacist capitalist gain.

#### No blowback

Johnston 2012 (Patrick B. Johnston Does Decapitation Work? Assessing the Effectiveness of Leadership Targeting in Counterinsurgency Campaigns, International Security 36:4 (Spring 2012): 47-79. <http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/ISEC_a_00076>, bs)

There is little evidence of a “blowback effect.” As the blowback hypothesis would predict, the point estimates for failed attempts are negative, which indicates that failed attempts to capture or kill insurgent leaders may have counterproductive effects on governments’ chances of defeating insurgencies. There is not enough evidence, however, to reject the null hypothesis—that failed decapitation operations have no overall impact on states’ chances of strategic success. Indeed, the estimated effect of failed attempts is small and far from statistically significant, with p-values that range from 0.356 to 0.788. Taken together, this evidence strongly indicates that the successful removal of insurgent leaders, not blowback from failed attempts, underlies my key findings on the effects of leadership decapitation in counterinsurgency operations.

#### Checks on the executive prevent effective responses to nuke terror 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.

#### Drones link turn terrorism

Byman, 2013 (Daniel, Foreign Affairs, The Case for Washington’s¶ Weapon of Choice, Why Drones Work, Volume 92 Number 4, July/August 2013, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/139453/daniel-byman/why-drones-work bs)

The Obama administration relies on drones for one simple reason: they work. According to data compiled by the New America Foundation,¶ since Obama has been in the White House, U.S. drones have killed an estimated 3,300 al Qaeda, Taliban, and other jihadist operatives in Pakistan and Yemen. That number includes over 50 senior leaders of al Qaeda and the Taliban—top figures who are not easily replaced. In¶ 2010, Osama bin Laden warned his chief aide, Atiyah Abd al-Rahman,¶ who was later killed by a drone strike in the Waziristan region of¶ Pakistan in 2011, that when experienced leaders are eliminated, the¶ result is “the rise of lower leaders who are not as experienced as¶ the former leaders” and who are prone to errors and miscalculations.¶ And drones also hurt terrorist organizations when they eliminate operatives who are lower down on the food chain but who boast special skills: passport forgers, bomb makers, recruiters, and fundraisers. Drones have also undercut terrorists’ ability to communicate and to train new recruits. In order to avoid attracting drones, al Qaeda and Taliban operatives try to avoid using electronic devices or gathering in large numbers. A tip sheet found among jihadists in Mali advised¶ militants to “maintain complete silence of all wireless contacts” and¶ “avoid gathering in open areas.” Leaders, however, cannot give orders when they are incommunicado, and training on a large scale is nearly impossible when a drone strike could wipe out an entire group of new recruits. Drones have turned al Qaeda’s command and training structure into a liability, forcing the group to choose between having no leaders and risking dead leaders.

#### Overall levels of violence may increase, but the effectiveness of those attacks drops

Wilner 10, (Alex S. Wilner, Center for Security Studies, ETH Zurich, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Targeted Killings in Afghanistan: Measuring Coercion and Deterrence in Counterterrorism and Counterinsurgency, Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, Vol. 33 No. 4, 09 Mar 2010, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10576100903582543)

Generally, overall violence increased following the targeted eliminations (Figure 2). This was especially so with the Dadullah case. On the surface, these are unanticipated developments.74 The literature on targeted killings suggests that eliminations should result in a general diminishment of violence. In their quantitative analysis of Israel’s campaign of targeted killings between 2000 and 2004, Mohammed Hafez and Joseph Hatfield provide similar findings. They conclude that “targeted assassinations have no significant impact on rates of Palestinian violence.”75 That both this and the Hafez/Hatfield study find trends that contradict theoretical expectations would suggest that certain components of the literature on targeted killings need to be substantially revised. However, a closer examination of the Afghan data does corroborate the literature’s most basic theoretical principle: targeted killings influence the type of violence terrorists are capable of planning effectively and forces them to conduct less-preferred forms of activity.¶ Violent, non-state organizations have coercive preferences. The Taliban is no exception. The type of violence they engage in rests as much on the impact they are trying to have as it does on their capacity and capability to muster efforts toward particular goals. To that end, suicide attacks are the Taliban’s preferred tactic—they are the most effective form of violence, provide the greatest consequence (both in kill ratios and psychological effect), can be directed against hard targets, are difficult to detect, stop, and mitigate, and have a proven track record of killing Coalition and Afghan soldiers. Suicide bombings are also the most sophisticated type of violence to plan, the most difficult to organize effectively, and take a considerable amount of time, energy, and expertise to mount successfully. Improvised Explosive Devices (IED) are the Taliban’s second most preferred tactic—they have proven deadly against Afghan National Police (ANP) and other lightly armored ISAF/NATO and Afghan National Army (ANA) personnel carriers, they are cheaply constructed, and provide a deadly concentrated explosive blast. IEDs are also less sophisticated than suicide bombs and are easier to organize effectively. They offer less control, however, cannot be consistently directed against particular targets, can be detected and diffused more easily than suicide bombs, their detonation can be mitigated with proper armor, and they are all too often triggered by civilians. Small arms and rocket fire (SA/R) is the Taliban’s least preferred tactic—it is most effective against soft targets, Afghan and international officials, lightly armed ANP forces, and when used in complex ambushes. However, SA/R attacks against security forces can be easily mitigated and usually result in a disproportionately high rate of Taliban casualties. Likewise, Taliban SA/R attacks are usually successfully repelled and the heavy concentration of gunmen in one location can be easily attacked with aerial support. Furthermore, Taliban rocket fire is crude, uncontrolled, and ineffective. In sum, SA/R attacks are the least sophisticated type of violence and the easiest to organize yet provide the worst results.¶ With these Taliban preferences in mind, the aggregate data on overall levels of violence reveal a number of expected findings. After the targeted killings, for instance, suicide bombings dropped by over 30 percent, from a total of 43 before, to 29 after, the targeted eliminations. This is in keeping with the degree of difficulty, amount of time and expertise, and level of leadership that is required to coordinate effective suicide bombings. It is also plausible that the decrease in suicide attacks spurred a rise in less-sophisticated forms of violence, with IEDs increasing by 6 percent and SA/R attacks by roughly 15 percent following the four targeted attacks.76 As leaders and facilitators were eliminated, the Taliban began using less-sophisticated forms of violence that required less energy, expertise, and time to organize effectively. This shift resonates with elements outlined in the literature on targeted killings: as organizations succumb to the effects of a protracted campaign of elimination, their overall ability to operate at a high level of sophistication decreases and the selection and use of less formidable forms of violence increases.¶ Overall levels of violence, however, are only a minor part of the analysis. The data also reveal changes in Taliban professionalism following the targeted killings. For the two most sophisticated forms of violence (IEDs and suicide attacks), the aggregate data suggest a decrease in professionalism and an increase in failure rates. After the eliminations, IED failure rates rose precipitously from 20 to roughly 35 percent. This is a considerable change in proficiency. Suicide bombing success rates also dropped (by a less impressive though no less important five percentage points) following the strikes. Both are theoretically expected findings (Figure 3). Finally, the data also suggest that the targeted killings influenced the selection of targets. For instance, in terms of known target selection for suicide bombers, the aggregate data reveal that following the eliminations, soft targets were more often selected (as a percentage of all target selection) after the leadership strikes (Figure 4). As leaders where killed, remaining forces selected less formidable targets to attack, like Afghan government officials, civil-society actors, and off-duty police commanders, rather than hardened, military actors.

#### Promise of future economic cooperation means no Indo-Pak conflict

Amina Afzal September 19th**,** 2013 (Islamabad based researcher with an MSc in Defence and Strategic Studies.”India-Pakistan Relations: Inching towards Mutually Assured Stability?” <http://southasianvoices.org/india-pakistan-relations-inching-towards-mutually-assured-stability/>, KMH)

Similarly, Prime Minister Sharif’s advisors as well as foreign policy-making institutions in Pakistan have advised him to proceed with caution as far as normalizing relations with India is concerned. According to official PML-N sources also there is no significant foreign policy initiative towards India on the cards in the near future. Although the government is clear that it wants to normalize its relations with India, Pakistan is beset with numerous domestic problems, which need to be taken care of before the country starts grappling with issues related to foreign policy. According to a senior PML-N leader, “The electricity crisis has overshadowed everything else, it has even overshadowed diplomacy.” In this backdrop a welcome development has been Pakistan’s willingness to import electricity from India. Both countries have in fact shown an interest to explore this option. Recently a power ministry delegation from India visited Pakistan to discuss the over all framework of the proposed arrangement. In a related development, Pakistan High Commissioner Salman Bashir called on the Indian Commerce and Industry Minister Anand Sharma to discuss the possibilities of economic cooperation between the two countries. The possibility of economic relations governing political relations can theoretically work under normal circumstances. If relations between two countries are normal, the economic factor automatically assumes the dominant role. Although the India-Pakistan relationship is far from normal right now there is hope that the two countries can overcome existing obstacles and work towards building a peaceful relationship. The time may not be right for India and Pakistan to engage in a strategic dialogue but it sure is ripe for both nations to pave the way for such a dialogue in the future. Enhancing mutual trade for example would help lay the foundation for future dialogue when the opportunity does arise. From the Pakistani side a first step in the right direction would be granting most favored nation (MFN) status to India. Doing so could imply challenges for Pakistani industrial sectors once trade is opened up under the MFN. Pakistani enterprises would of course need to enhance their competitiveness and productivity to compete in international markets. MFN is one of the fundamental principles of the multilateral trading system and as such an economic obligation on Pakistan. India conferred this status on Pakistan in 1996. Experts believe that delaying this matter any further could have the potential to diminish the spirit of any future dialogues between the two countries. Granting MFN status to India has misleading interpretations in Pakistan. Many in Pakistan believe it means granting India the status of “most favorite nation” whereas it simply means giving similar trade concessions as accorded to other WTO member states. If such an arrangement can be worked out in the initial phase, the next step could be the creation of joint ventures between the two countries.

#### The Pakistan impact is orientalist

Said in 2001

(Edward W., former Professor of English and Comparative Literature at Columbia University, “The Clash of Ignorance”, *The Nation*, October 22, http://chss.montclair.edu/english/furr/pol/wtc/saidclash.html, rcheek)

Samuel Huntington's article "The Clash of Civilizations?" appeared in the Summer 1993 issue of Foreign Affairs, where it immediately attracted a surprising amount of attention and reaction. Because the article was intended to supply Americans with an original thesis about "a new phase" in world politics after the end of the cold war, Huntington's terms of argument seemed compellingly large, bold, even visionary. He very clearly had his eye on rivals in the policy-making ranks, theorists such as Francis Fukuyama and his "end of history" ideas, as well as the legions who had celebrated the onset of globalism, tribalism and the dissipation of the state. But they, he allowed, had understood only some aspects of this new period. He was about to announce the "crucial, indeed a central, aspect" of what "global politics is likely to be in the coming years." Unhesitatingly he pressed on: "It is my hypothesis that the fundamental source of conflict in this new world will not be primarily ideological or primarily economic. The great divisions among humankind and the dominating source of conflict will be cultural. Nation states will remain the most powerful actors in world affairs, but the principal conflicts of global politics will occur between nations and groups of different civilizations. The clash of civilizations will dominate global politics. The fault lines between civilizations will be the battle lines of the future." Most of the argument in the pages that followed relied on a vague notion of something Huntington called "civilization identity" and "the interactions among seven or eight [sic] major civilizations," of which the conflict between two of them, Islam and the West, gets the lion's share of his attention. In this belligerent kind of thought, he relies heavily on a 1990 article by the veteran Orientalist Bernard Lewis, whose ideological colors are manifest in its title, "The Roots of Muslim Rage." In both articles, the personification of enormous entities called "the West" and "Islam" is recklessly affirmed, as if hugely complicated matters like identity and culture existed in a cartoonlike world where Popeye and Bluto bash each other mercilessly, with one always more virtuous pugilist getting the upper hand over his adversary. Certainly neither Huntington nor Lewis has much time to spare for the internal dynamics and plurality of every civilization, or for the fact that the major contest in most modern cultures concerns the definition or interpretation of each culture, or for the unattractive possibility that a great deal of demagogy and downright ignorance is involved in presuming to speak for a whole religion or civilization. No, the West is the West, and Islam Islam.

#### CBWs can’t be dispersed

Smithson**,** project director for biological weapons at the Henry L. Stimson Center, 2005 [Amy, "Likelihood of Terrorists Acquiring and Using Chemical or Biological Weapons". http:l/www.stimson.org/cbw/?SN=CB2001 12 1259]

Terrorists cannot count on just filling the delivery system with agent, pointing the device, flipping the switch to activate it. Facets that must be deciphered include the concentration of agent in the delivery system, the ways in which the delivery system degrades the potency of the agent, and the right dosage to incapacitate or kill human or animal targets. For open-air delivery. the meteorological conditions must be taken into account. Biological agents have extreme sensitivity to sunlight. humidity, pollutants in the atmosphere. temperature, and even exposure to oxvgen, all of which can kill the microbes. Biological agents can be dispersed in either dry or wet forms. Using a dn/ agent can boost effectiveness because drying and milling the agent can make the particles very fine, a key factor since particles must range between 1 to 10 ten microns, ideally to 1 to 5, to be breathed into the lungs. Drying an agent, however. is done through a complex and challenging process that rewires a sophistication of equipment and know-how that terrorist organizations are unlikely to acssess. The alternative is to develop a wet slurry, which is much easier to produce but a great deal harder to disperse effectively. Wet slurries can clog sprayers and undergo mechanical stresses that can kill 95 percent or more of the microorganisms.

#### No impact to oil shocks

Khadduri, 11(Former Middle East Economic Survey Editor-in-Chief, 8-23-11**,** Walid, "The impact of rising oil prices on the economies of importing nations", http://english.alarabiya.net/views/2011/08/23/163590.html)

**What is the impact of oil price shocks** on the economies of importing nations? **At first glance, there appears to be large-scale and extremely adverse repercussions for rising oil prices. However, a study published this month by researchers in the IMF** Working Paper group **suggests a different picture** altogether (it is worth mentioning that the IMF has not endorsed its findings.) **The study** (Tobias N. Rasmussen & Agustin Roitman, "Oil Shocks in a Global Perspective: Are They Really That Bad?", IMF Working Paper, August 2011) **mentions that** “Using a comprehensive global dataset […] **we find that the impact of higher oil prices on oil-importing economies is generally small: a 25 percent increase in oil prices typically causes GDP to fall by about half of one percent or less**.” The study elaborates on this by stating that this impact differs from one country to another, depending on the size of oil-imports, as “oil price shocks are not always costly for oil-importing countries: although higher oil prices increase the import bill, there are partly offsetting increases in external receipts [represented in new and additional expenditures borne by both oil-exporting and oil-importing countries]”. In other words, **the more oil prices increase, benefiting exporting countries, the more these new revenues are recycled, for example through the growth in demand for new services, labor, and commodity imports.** **The researchers argue that the series of oil price** rallies (in 1983, 1996, 2005, and **2009**) have **played an important role in recessions** in the United States. **However, Rasmussen and Roitman state** at the same time **that significant changes in the U.S. economy** in the previous period (the appearance of combined elements, **such as improvements in monetary policy, the institution of a labor market more flexible than before and a** relatively **smaller usage of oil in the** U.S. **economy**) **has greatly mitigated the negative effects of oil prices on the U.S. economy.**

### 1NC—Norms

#### Their assumption that China is a “knowable” object is dangerous and disinterested scholarship. The description of China as a threat creates a self-fulfilling prophecy that makes their impact inevitable

Pan in 2004

(Chengxin, PhD in Political Science and International Relations, The "China Threat" in American Self-Imagination: The Discursive Construction of Other as Power Politics, Alternatives, Vol. 29, Issue 3, rcheek)

While U.S. China scholars argue fiercely over "what China pre- cisely is," their debates have been underpinned by some common ground, especially in terms of a positivist epistemology. Firstly, they believe that China is ultimately a knowable object, whose reality can be, and ought to be, empirically revealed by scientific means. For example, after expressing his dissatisfaction with often con- flicting Western perceptions of China, David M. Lampton, former president of the National Committee on U.S.-China Relations, sug- gests that "it is time to step back and look at where China is today, where it might be going, and what consequences that direction will hold for the rest of the world."2 Like many other China scholars, Lampton views his object of study as essentially "something we can stand back from and observe with clinical detachment."^ Secondly, associated with the first assumption, it is commonly believed that China scholars merely serve as "disinterested observers" and that their studies of China are neutral, passive descriptions of reality. And thirdly, in pondering whether China poses a threat or offers an opportunity to the United States, they rarely raise the question of "what the United States is." That is, the meaning of the United States is believed to be certain and beyond doubt. I do not dismiss altogether the conventional ways of debating China. It is not the purpose of this article to venture my own "observation" of "where China is today," nor to join the "containment" versus "engagement" debate per se. Rather, I want to contribute to a novel dimension of the China debate by questioning the seemingly unproblematic assumptions shared by most China scholars in the mainstream IR community in the United States. To perform this task, I will focus attention on a particularly significant component of the China debate; namely, the "China threat" literature. More specifically, I want to argue that U.S. conceptions of China as a threatening other are always intrinsically linked to how U.S. policymakers/mainstream China specialists see themselves (as representatives of the indispensable, security-conscious nation, for example). As such, they are not value-free, objective descriptions of an independent, preexisting Chinese reality out there, but are better understood as a kind of normative, meaning-giving practice that often legitimates power politics in U.S.-China relations and helps transform the "China threat" into social reality. In other words, it is self-fulfilling in practice, and is always part of the "China threat" problem it purports merely to describe. In doing so, I seek to bring to the fore two interconnected themes of self/other constructions and of theory as practice inherent in the "China threat" literature—themes that have been overridden and rendered largely invisible by those common positivist assumptions. These themes are of course nothing new nor peculiar to the "China threat" literature. They have been identified elsewhere by critics of some conventional fields of study such as ethnography, anthropology, oriental studies, political science, and international relations.\* Yet, so far, the China field in the West in general and the U.S. "China threat" literature in particular have shown remarkable resistance to systematic critical reflection on both their normative status as discursive practice and their enormous practical implications for international politics.^ It is in this context that this article seeks to make a contribution.

#### Their impact is rooted in a securitizing discourse that makes violence inevitable

Pan in 2004

(Chengxin, PhD in Political Science and International Relations, The "China Threat" in American Self-Imagination: The Discursive Construction of Other as Power Politics, Alternatives, Vol. 29, Issue 3, rcheek)

Having examined how the "China threat" literature is enabled by and serves the purpose of a particular U.S. self-construction, I want to turn now to the issue of how this literature represents a discursive construction of other, instead of an "objective" account of Chinese reality. This, I argue, has less to do with its portrayal of China as a threat per se than with its essentialization and totalization of China as an externally knowable object, independent of historically contingent contexts or dynamic international interactions. In this sense, the discursive construction of China as a threatening other cannot be detached from (neo)realism, a positivist. ahistorical framework of analysis within which global life is reduced to endless interstate rivalry for power and survival. As many critical IR scholars have noted, (neo) realism is not a transcendent description of global reality but is predicated on the modernist Western identity, which, in the quest for scientific certainty, has come to define itself essentially as the sovereign territorial nation-state. This realist self-identity of Western states leads to the constitution of anarchy as the sphere of insecurity, disorder, and war. In an anarchical system, as (neo) realists argue, "the gain of one side is often considered to be the loss of the other,"''5 and "All other states are potential threats."'•^ In order to survive in such a system, states inevitably pursue power or capability. In doing so, these realist claims represent what R. B. J. Walker calls "a specific historical articulation of relations of universality/particularity and self/Other."^^ The (neo) realist paradigm has dominated the U.S. IR discipline in general and the U.S. China studies field in particular. As Kurt Campbell notes, after the end of the Cold War, a whole new crop of China experts "are much more likely to have a background in strategic studies or international relations than China itself. ""^^ As a result, for those experts to know China is nothing more or less than to undertake a geopolitical analysis of it, often by asking only a few questions such as how China will "behave" in a strategic sense and how it may affect the regional or global balance of power, with a particular emphasis on China's military power or capabilities. As Thomas J. Christensen notes, "Although many have focused on intentions as well as capabilities, the most prevalent component of the [China threat] debate is the assessment of China's overall future military power compared with that of the United States and other East Asian regional powers."''^ Consequently, almost by default, China emerges as an absolute other and a threat thanks to this (neo) realist prism. The (neo)realist emphasis on survival and security in inter- national relations dovetails perfectly with the U.S. self-imagination, because for the United States to define itself as the indispensable nation in a world of anarchy is often to demand absolute security. As James Chace and Caleb Carr note, "for over two centuries the aspiration toward an eventual condition of absolute security has been viewed as central to an effective American foreign policy."50 And this self-identification in turn leads to the definition of not only "tangible" foreign powers but global contingency and uncertainty per se as threats. For example, former U.S. President George H. W. Bush repeatedly said that "the enemy [of America] is unpredictability. The enemy is instability. "5' Similarly, arguing for the continuation of U.S. Cold War alliances, a high-ranking Pentagon official asked, "if we pull out, who knows what nervousness will result? "^2 Thus understood, by its very uncertain character, China would now automatically constitute a threat to the United States. For example, Bernstein and Munro believe that "China's political unpredictability, the always-present possibility that it will fall into a state of domestic disunion and factional fighting," constitutes a source of danger.s^ In like manner, Richard Betts and Thomas Christensen write: If the PLA [People's Liberation Army] remains second-rate, should the world breathe a sigh of relief? Not entirely. . . . Drawing China into the web of global interdependence may do more to encourage peace than war, but it cannot guarantee that the pursuit of heartfelt political interests will be blocked by a fear of economic consequences. . . . U.S. efforts to create a stable balance across the Taiwan Strait might deter the use of force under certain circumstances, but certainly not all.54 The upshot, therefore, is that since China displays no absolute certainty for peace, it must be, by definition, an uncertainty, and hence, a threat. In the same way, a multitude of other unpredictable factors (such as ethnic rivalry, local insurgencies, overpopulation, drug trafficking, environmental degradation, rogue states, the spread of weapons of mass destruction, and international terrorism) have also been labeled as "threats" to U.S. security. Yet, it seems that in the post-Cold War environment, China represents a kind of uncertainty par excellence. "Whatever the prospects for a more peaceful, more democratic, and more just world order, nothing seems more uncertain today than the future of post-Deng China,"55 argues Samuel Kim. And such an archetypical uncertainty is crucial to the enterprise of U.S. self-construction, because it seems that only an uncertainty with potentially global consequences such as China could justify U.S. indispensability or its continued world dominance. In this sense, Bruce Cumings aptly suggested in 1996 that China (as a threat) was basically "a metaphor for an enormously expensive Pentagon that has lost its bearings and that requires a formidable 'renegade state' to define its mission (Islam is rather vague, and Iran lacks necessary weights)."56

## 2NC—Islam K

### AT—Extinction

#### We are already dead

Bahder in 2007

(Paul, Medical Doctor, “We Are Already Dead”, <http://www.homeopathyusa.com/we_are_already_dead.htm>, rcheek)

What we call “our life” is really the experience that takes place in time and space. The ever-changing character of our physical experience has led the Buddha to formulate the Law of Impermanence and Jesus to say, “My kingdom is not of this world.” The underlying commonality between these pointers to truth is the realization that the physical experience of being alive is temporary, changing and in a deeper way not the ground reality of what is. It is the realization that behind this world of appearances there exists a realm, a context that is changeless, not limited by time or space.¶ When we are fixated and bound by the impermanent flow of experience we are in fact unaware of the changeless context of consciousness. The relentless passing of what we see, hear, taste, touch, smell, of what we imagine or think means that we are already possessed by time and dead to the timeless. It means that time, the condition of passing on and ending everything without an exception is really the realm of death – the end of what we know.¶ We are in fact already dead and it is only our unresolved issues that keep us attached to the world of images and sounds that we know. Our family, the places we know, the settings that have served as the background to the story of our life – these are the emotional attachment points keeping us in the past and preventing us from recognizing that this past is in fact already GONE. We are already dead to the past. The past is no longer here. It is gone as we know it. It exists only as reflections in our mind bringing up emotional content and drawing us into the dream we call “our life.”¶ The future likewise is not here. We do not have life in the future simply because the future is not here. We cannot live in the future. We cannot eat, or kiss or cry in the future. Our experience is always now even if it involves images symbolic of another time. The past is gone, the future is not yet here. Time removes us from living to dreaming. “Don’t look back. Move on. You are already dead.” This is the priceless advice we receive about our experience in the physical realm.¶ Tibetan Book of the Dead is in fact the book of the living. It calls adepts to awake into a higher sense of reality, out of the temporal to life eternal. It reminds us over and over again saying, “You are dead. Keep moving toward the light. Do not look back. Recognize you are already dead.” It assures us that the sensory-mental experience we may be having is a delusion, a mirage engaging out attention in empty, lifeless images. True life lies ahead, in the unknown. True life is being revealed to us in the present moment. It is timeless and it cannot exist in time. That is why it has no duration. Its appearance is signaling at the same time its dissolution and end. Time does not exist in the eternal. The eternal is timeless. The eternal is not a whole lot of time. Time has no entrance into eternal even though eternal permeates time.

### Transcendental Ethic

#### In order to reach an ideal of true unity we must embrace a transcendental ethic—instead of attempting to reverse whiteness we must center community around the oneness of God and creation

Salahuddin 1995 [Abubakr Ben Ishmael Salahuddin ; black American religious author “The Afrocentric Myth or Islam: The Liberator of the American People”//BlackMagic]

If a homogenous nation of 1.2 billion people is forced to integrate "outside" philosophies, then isolation is now impossible for everyone else also, especially if there does not exist a strong and transcendent belief system. The above examples demonstrate that communism has proven itself weak, as has Black Cultural Nationalism. Any sustainable world-view developed will have to be based on the single most important concept in the universe—unity. This involves a concept of the unity (oneness) of God as well as the unity of human beings. It is said that we are all part of one global village. This condition makes it more than obvious that a universal world-view is needed which can accommodate the needs of everyone. That universal world view will unfold within the religion of Islam. It is my belief that natural and spiritual forces, though they are being viciously opposed by many human beings, are leading the world toward unity. This unity will be achieved in earnest once a reconciliation between God and humans occurs. In my view, whoever achieves the development of a sustainable world-view based on unity will be the leaders of the future. The preparation needed for that leadership in the coming world involves reconciliation with God as well as acquiring a mastery of the principle of unity. I am not speaking merely of some superficial practice of unity as in "let's all hold hands" on the "international day of unity." I'm speaking of the true realization of unity. In 1978 the internationally renowned scientist, Professor Abdus Salaam, won a Nobel prize in physics precisely for proving that three forces within the atom which were previously thought of as "separate" are manifestations of one force. So from the atomic level, to the information highway, to the ever increasing interaction between human beings on this earth, everything is pointing to the principle of unity. It is sad that sectors of human society are fighting this principle so vigorously, holding to their tribal identities, not realizing what is on the horizon. White Supremacists definitely do not want unity because the concept of what Muslims call Ummah ("community") destroys race-based identity. Without "white" as identity, what would be left? The dominance of "whites" in this society is not due to the fact that they possess a fundamentally "strong and cohesive" identity, as has been suggested by some Black Cultural Nationalists in defense of their stand on race-based identity. Whites do not possess a strong and cohesive identity. They possess, in fact, a false and weak identity. Though their identity is fundamentally false and weak, it has held together because of an historical tacit "agreement" regarding the validity of the notion of race—perhaps the largest sociological myth of all times—and the idea of racial superiority. Until recently, that "agreement" has held strong. But the fact that "white" as true identity is fundamentally false and weak is being demonstrated in the increased social interaction between people of different "races" in this country, despite the false perception that there exists an unchallenged trend toward a more balkanized "multiculturalism." There is, for example, a growing number of "interracial" organizations (69 nationally) and moderate interracial magazines, such as the increasingly influential Interrace magazine and the newer New People magazine. There are also a growing number of radical journals such as Race Traitor, edited by Harvard-based Noel Ignatiev. That journal, whose motto is "treason to whiteness is loyalty to humanity," has made the controversial claim that, "the key to solving the social problems of our age is to abolish the white race." This is very controversial indeed, especially considering that most of the editors and contributors to that magazine are white! The Monitor, published by the Center for Democratic Renewal, The Race Mixer, published by Communities Against Hate, and Turning the Tide, published by People Against Racist Terror are other examples of publications which challenge what some of them term as "whiteness." The myth is breaking down and revealing the fundamental weakness and falsity of the "white" identity [it should be understood that "whiteness" is a condition which many non-Caucasians suffer from also].

### God Exists

#### God is that than which none greater can be conceived.

Anselm 2007

(St. Anselm, “The Ontological Argument”, Pages 3-5, Philosophy of Religion: An Anthology, Louis Pojman, Michael Rea, Dil)

Therefore, Lord, you who grant understanding to faith, grant that, insofar as you know it is useful for me, I may understand that you exist as we believe you exist, and that you are what we believe you to be. Now we believe that you are something than which nothing greater can ST. ANSELM ! The Ontological Argument 3 be thought. So can it be that no such nature exists, since ‘‘The fool has said in his heart, ‘There is no God’’’ (Psalm 14:1; 53:1)? But when this same fool hears me say ‘‘something than which nothing greater can be thought,’’ he surely understands what he hears; and what he understands exists in his understanding,1 even if he does not understand that it exists [in reality]. For it is one thing for an object to exist in the understanding and quite another to understand that the object exists [in reality]. When a painter, for example, thinks out in advance what he is going to paint, he has it in his understanding, but he does not yet understand that it exists, since he has not yet painted it. But once he has painted it, he both has it in his understanding and understands that it exists because he has now painted it. So even the fool must admit that something than which nothing greater can be thought exists at least in his understanding, since he understands this when he hears it, and whatever is understood exists in the understanding. And surely that than which a greater cannot be thought cannot exist only in the understanding. For if it exists only in the understanding, it can be thought to exist in reality as well, which is greater. So if that than which a greater cannot be thought exists only in the understanding, then that than which a greater cannot be thought is that than which a greater can be thought. But that is clearly impossible. Therefore, there is no doubt that something than which a greater cannot be thought exists both in the understanding and in reality. . . . This [being] exists so truly that it cannot be thought not to exist. For it is possible to think that something exists that cannot be thought not to exist, and such a being is greater than one that can be thought not to exist. Therefore, if that than which a greater cannot be thought can be thought not to exist, then that than which a greater cannot be thought is not that than which a greater cannot be thought; and this is a contradiction. So that than which a greater cannot be thought exists so truly that it cannot be thought not to exist. And this is you, O Lord our God. You exist so truly, O Lord my God, that you cannot be thought not to exist. And rightly so, for if some mind could think something better than you, a creature would rise above the Creator and sit in judgment upon him, which is completely absurd. Indeed, everything that exists, except for you alone, can be thought not to exist. So you alone among all things have existence most truly, and therefore most greatly. Whatever else exists has existence less truly, and therefore less greatly. So then why did ‘‘the fool say in his heart, ‘There is no God,’’’ when it is so evident to the rational mind that you among all beings exist most greatly? Why indeed, except because he is stupid and a fool? . . . But how has he said in his heart what he could not think? Or how could he not think what he said in his heart, since to say in one’s heart is the same as to think? But if he really–or rather, since he really–thought this, because he said it in his heart, and did not say it in his heart, because he could not think it, there must be more than one way in which something is ‘‘said in one’s heart’’ or ‘‘thought.’’ In one sense of the word, to think a thing is to think the word that signifies that thing. But in another sense, it is to understand what exactly the thing is. God can be thought not to exist in the first sense, but not at all in the second sense. No one who understands what God is can think that God does not exist, although he may say these words in his heart with no signification at all, or with some peculiar signification. For God is that than which a greater cannot be thought. Whoever understands this properly, understands that this being exists in such a way that he cannot, even in thought, fail to exist. So whoever understands that God exists in this way cannot think that he does not exist. Thanks be to you, my good Lord, thanks be to you. For what I once believed through your grace, I now understand through your illumination, so that even if I did not want to believe that you exist, I could not fail to understand that you exist. . . .

#### And, God exists and that is beautiful

Himma in 2005

(Kenneth Einar, Associate Professor, Seattle Pacific University, Department of Philosophy, “Ontological Argument”, Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, <http://www.iep.utm.edu/ont-arg/>, rcheek)

In contrast, the ontological arguments are conceptual in roughly the following sense: just as the propositions constituting the concept of a bachelor imply that every bachelor is male, the propositions constituting the concept of God, according to the ontological argument, imply that God exists. There is, of course, this difference: whereas the concept of a bachelor explicitly contains the proposition that bachelors are unmarried, the concept of God does not explicitly contain any proposition asserting the existence of such a being. Even so, the basic idea is the same: ontological arguments attempt to show that we can deduce God’s existence from, so to speak, the very definition of God.¶ It is worth reflecting for a moment on what a remarkable (and beautiful!) undertaking this is. Normally, existential claims don’t follow from conceptual claims. If I want to prove that bachelors, unicorns, or viruses exist, it is not enough just to reflect on the concepts. I need to go out into the world and conduct some sort of empirical investigation using my senses. Likewise, if I want to prove that bachelors, unicorns, or viruses don’t exist, I must do the same. In general, positive and negative existential claims can be established only by empirical methods.¶ There is, however, one class of exceptions. We can prove certain negative existential claims merely by reflecting on the content of the concept. Thus, for example, we can determine that there are no square circles in the world without going out and looking under every rock to see whether there is a square circle there. We can do so merely by consulting the definition and seeing that it is self-contradictory. Thus, the very concepts imply that there exist no entities that are both square and circular.¶ The ontological argument, then, is unique among such arguments in that it purports to establish the real (as opposed to abstract) existence of some entity. Indeed, if the ontological arguments succeed, it is as much a contradiction to suppose that God doesn’t exist as it is to suppose that there are square circles or female bachelors. In the following sections, we will evaluate a number of different attempts to develop this astonishing strategy.¶ 2. The Classic Version of the Ontological Argument¶ a. The Argument Described¶ St. Anselm, Archbishop of Cantebury (1033-1109), is the originator of the ontological argument, which he describes in the Proslogium as follows:¶ [Even a] fool, when he hears of … a being than which nothing greater can be conceived … understands what he hears, and what he understands is in his understanding.… And assuredly that, than which nothing greater can be conceived, cannot exist in the understanding alone. For suppose it exists in the understanding alone: then it can be conceived to exist in reality; which is greater.… Therefore, if that, than which nothing greater can be conceived, exists in the understanding alone, the very being, than which nothing greater can be conceived, is one, than which a greater can be conceived. But obviously this is impossible. Hence, there is no doubt that there exists a being, than which nothing greater can be conceived, and it exists both in the understanding and in reality.¶ The argument in this difficult passage can accurately be summarized in standard form:¶ It is a conceptual truth (or, so to speak, true by definition) that God is a being than which none greater can be imagined (that is, the greatest possible being that can be imagined).¶ God exists as an idea in the mind.¶ A being that exists as an idea in the mind and in reality is, other things being equal, greater than a being that exists only as an idea in the mind.¶ Thus, if God exists only as an idea in the mind, then we can imagine something that is greater than God (that is, a greatest possible being that does exist).¶ But we cannot imagine something that is greater than God (for it is a contradiction to suppose that we can imagine a being greater than the greatest possible being that can be imagined.)¶ Therefore, God exists.

### First Cause

#### There must be a first cause, and that cause is God

Vlach accessed in 2011

(Michael J., Associate Professor of Theology at the Master's Seminary in Sun Valley, California, “The 4 Primary Arguments for God's Existence”, http://www.theologicalstudies.org/page/page/1572404.htm, accessed 2/1/2011)

The term “cosmological” comes from the Greek word “kosmos” which means “world.” The cosmological argument for God’s existence goes like this: The world could not exist on its own so there must have been a first cause that brought it into being. This first cause is God. Or put another way, the universe could not just exist on its own—someone or something must have made it. This cause of the universe is God.

#### God is the only explanation for the big bang

Adamson accessed in 2011

(Marilyn, Former Atheist, “Is there a God?”, http://www.everystudent.com/features/isthere.html, accessed 2/1/2011)

Scientists are convinced that our universe began with one enormous explosion of energy and light, which we now call the Big Bang. This was the singular start to everything that exists: the beginning of the universe, the start of space, and even the initial start of time itself. Astrophysicist Robert Jastrow, a self-described agnostic, stated, "The seed of everything that has happened in the Universe was planted in that first instant; every star, every planet and every living creature in the Universe came into being as a result of events that were set in motion in the moment of the cosmic explosion...The Universe flashed into being, and we cannot find out what caused that to happen."9 Steven Weinberg, a Nobel laureate in Physics, said at the moment of this explosion, "the universe was about a hundred thousands million degrees Centigrade...and the universe was filled with light."10 The universe has not always existed. It had a start...what caused that? Scientists have no explanation for the sudden explosion of light and matter.

### Aquinas

#### Motion

Aquinas 07

(St. Thomas, “The Five Ways”, pages 12-14, Philosophy of Religion: An Anthology, Louis Pojman, Michael Rea, Dil)

There are five ways to prove that God exists. The first and clearest way is that taken from motion: It is certain, and obvious to the senses, that in this world some things are moved. But everything that is moved is moved by another. For nothing is moved except insofar as it is in potentiality with respect to that actuality toward which it is moved, whereas something effects motion insofar as it is in actuality in a relevant respect. After all, to effect motion is just to lead something from potentiality into actuality. But a thing cannot be led from potentiality into actuality except through some being that is in actuality in a relevant respect; for example, something that is hot in actuality—say, a fire—makes a piece of wood, which is hot in potentiality, to be hot in actuality, and it thereby moves and alters the piece of wood. But it is impossible for something to be simultaneously in potentiality and in actuality with respect to same thing; rather, it can be in potentiality and in actuality only with respect to different things. For what is hot in actuality cannot simultaneously be hot in potentiality; rather, it is cold in potentiality. Therefore, it is impossible that something should be both mover and moved in the same way and with respect to the same thing, or, in other words, that something should move itself. Therefore, everything that is moved must be moved by another. If, then, that by which something is moved is itself moved, then it, too, must be moved by another, and that other by still another. But this does not go on to infinity. For if it did, then there would not be any first mover and, as a result, none of the others would effect motion, either. For secondary movers effect motion only because they are being moved by a first mover, just as a stick does not effect motion except because it is being moved by a hand. Therefore, one has to arrive at some first mover that is not being moved by anything. And this is what everyone takes to be God.

### Science

#### Science proves God exists

Collins 07

(Robin, “A Scientific Argument for the Existence of God”, 75-89, Philosophy of Religion: An Anthology, Louis Pojman, Michael Rea, Dil)

The universe is analogous to such a ‘‘biosphere,’’ according to recent findings in physics. Almost everything about the basic structure of the universe—for example, the fundamental laws and parameters of physics and the initial distribution of matter and energy—is balanced on a razor’s edge for life to occur. As the eminent Princeton physicist Freeman Dyson notes, ‘‘There are many . . . lucky accidents in physics. Without such accidents, water could not exist as liquid, chains of carbon atoms could not form complex organic molecules, and hydrogen atoms could not form breakable bridges between molecules’’1—in short, life as we know it would be impossible. Scientists call this extraordinary balancing of the parameters of physics and the initial conditions of the universe the ‘‘fine-tuning of the cosmos.’’ It has been extensively discussed by philosophers, theologians, and scientists, especially since the early 1970s, with hundreds of articles and dozens of books written on the topic. Today, it is widely regarded as offering by far the most persuasive current argument for the existence of God. For example, theoretical physicist and popular science writer Paul Davies—whose early writings were not particularly sympathetic to theism—claims that with regard to basic structure of the universe, ‘‘the impression of design is overwhelming.’’2 Similarly, in response to the life-permitting finetuning of the nuclear resonances responsible for the oxygen and carbon synthesis in stars, the famous astrophysicist Sir Fred Hoyle declares that I do not believe that any scientists who examined the evidence would fail to draw the inference that the laws of nuclear physics have been deliberately designed with regard to the consequences they produce inside stars. If this is so, then my apparently random quirks have become part of a deep-laid scheme. If not then we are back again at a monstrous sequence of accidents.3 A few examples of this fine-tuning are listed below: 1. If the initial explosion of the big bang had differed in strength by as little as one part in 1060, the universe would have either quickly collapsed back on itself, or expanded too rapidly for stars to form. In either case, life would be impossible. (As John Jefferson Davis points out, an accuracy of one part in 1060can be compared to firing a bullet at a one-inch target on the other side of the observable universe, twenty billion light years away, and hitting the target.)4 2. Calculations indicate that if the strong nuclear force, the force that binds protons and neutrons together in an atom, had been stronger or weaker by as little as five percent, life would be impossible.5 3. Calculations by Brandon Carter show that if gravity had been stronger or weaker by one part in 1040, then life-sustaining stars like the sun could not exist. This would most likely make life impossible.6 4. If the neutron were not about 1.001 times the mass of the proton, all protons would have decayed into neutrons or all neutrons would have decayed into protons, and thus life would not be possible.7 5. If the electromagnetic force were slightly stronger or weaker, life would be impossible, for a variety of different reasons.8 Imaginatively, one could think of each instance of fine-tuning as a radio dial: unless all the dials are set exactly right, life would be impossible. Or, one could think of the initial conditions of the universe and the fundamental parameters of physics as a dart board that fills thewhole galaxy, and the conditions necessary for life to exist as a small one-foot wide target: unless the dart hits the target, life would be impossible. The fact that the dials are perfectly set, or that the dart has hit the target, strongly suggests that someone set the dials or aimed the dart, for it seems enormously improbable that such a coincidence could have happened by chance.

## 1NR—Case

### Oil

#### Framing oil as a security issue sets the stage for preemptive resource wars and consumption as the real issue.

Campbell 05 (David, PhD Professor at Australian National University, “The Biopolitics of Security: Oil, Empire, and the Sports Utility Vehicle,” American Quarterly, Vol 57, No 3, September, Muse)

Most accounts of the role of oil in U.S. foreign policy embody economistic assumptions, rendering oil in materialistic terms as an independent variable that causes states to behave in particular ways. In the prelude to the invasion of Iraq, even the best commentaries represented oil as the real reason motivating the buildup to war.28 In this vein, a Greenpeace campaign pictured the (oil) “drums of war” and invited people to read about “what’s really behind the war on Iraq.”29 In addition to manifesting specific epistemological assumptions, these views regard resource geopolitics as primarily a question of supply. Before we move beyond this frame of reference to explore what goes unexplained by this focus, we need to appreciate the infrastructure of oil resource geopolitics that makes this issue so important. Securing global oil supply has been a tenet of U.S. foreign policy in the post–World War II era. Because the Middle East holds two-thirds of the known reserves of oil, this objective has made the region an unavoidable concern for successive U.S. administrations. As the largest and most economical supplier of Middle East oil, Saudi Arabia has had a central place in this strategic calcu-lation, with the United States agreeing to defend (internally and externally) the Saudi regime in return for privileged access to Saudi oil. Over the years, this arrangement has cost the United States tens of billions of dollars in military assistance.30 This strategy was formalized in the Carter Doctrine of 1980, which, in the wake of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, declared that any power that threatened to control the Persian Gulf area would be directly challenging fundamental U.S. national security interests and would be seen as engaged in an assault on the United States. None of this would be required if the United States did not rely on imported oil for its economic well-being. However, in 2002 oil imports fueled 53 percent of domestic consumption, and the U.S. Department of Energy forecasts only increasing dependence. By 2025 oil import dependence is expected to rise to around 70 percent of domestic needs.31 These percentages mean the United States will consume an additional 8.7 million barrels of oil per day by 2025. Given that total petroleum imports in 2002 were 11.4 million barrels per day, this is a very substantial increase. In recent years, faced with increased dependence on oil imports, the United States has been seeking to diversify supply, with some paradoxical outcomes. As the country was preparing to go to war with Iraq, the United States was importing half of all Iraqi exports (which satisfied only 8 percent of America’s needs), even though this indirectly funded the regime of Saddam Hussein.32 Some Republicans in Congress used this data to smear then-Democratic Senate leader Tom Daschle as an Iraqi sympathizer, arguing that the Democrat’s failure to support drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR)— as the Bush administration desired—forced America into unholy commercial alliances.33 While this argument conveniently overlooked the fact that ANWR’s 3 billion barrels of reserves could supply only six months of the United States’ total oil needs, it demonstrated how the internalization of a cleavage between business and environmental interests is sustained through an association with external threat.34 The drive for diversification is now a major security objective. In the 2001 review of energy policy chaired by Vice President Dick Cheney, the final chapter of the report focused exclusively on strengthening global alliances with energy producers to achieve that goal.35 However, the geopolitical pursuit of energy security is likely to produce new and intensive forms of insecurity for those in the new resource zones, which are located in some of the most strategically unstable global locations.36 As a result, the United States has been providing increased military support to governments in the Caspian Basin area, Latin America, and sub-Saharan Africa—regardless of their ideological complexion or human rights record.37 A geopolitical understanding of these developments is necessary but not sufficient. That is because the geopolitical frame focuses solely on the supply of oil without interrogating the demand for this resource that makes it so valuable. Possession of a material resource is meaningless unless social networks value that resource. As such, an analysis of the demand side, and attention to the politics of consumption as much as the problem of production, is a first step toward understanding the biopolitics of security.