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### Politics

#### Iran deal passes now, but it’s not perfect

Jim Sciutto, 11/15/13 Official: Talks 'getting close' to deal with Iran on nuclear program/ <http://www.cnn.com/2013/11/15/world/meast/iran-nuclear-deal/>) mt

The United States and other countries are "getting close" to an interim deal with Iran that would prevent its nuclear program "from advancing, and roll it back" in key areas, a senior administration official said Friday. Such a deal would "extend the breakout time" that Iran would need to achieve a nuclear weapon and "shorten the time to notice if they tried," the official told reporters on the condition of not being identified. The proposed deal -- covering every aspect of Iran's nuclear program, including uranium enrichment, uranium stockpiles and all nuclear facilities including military ones -- would be completed during the next round of talks in Geneva, Switzerland, though difficult issues remain, the official said. "We are going to work very hard next week, the official said. "I don't know if we'll reach an agreement. I think it is quite possible that we can. But there's still tough issues to negotiate." The United States, along with the four other permanent members of the U.N. Security Council and Germany -- the so-called P5+1 -- came close to a deal during talks with Iran last week in Geneva, but the discussions ended with both sides blaming each other for the lack of an agreement.

#### **Capital is key**

Matthew 11/13/13 Francis Matthew 11/13/13 Nuclear deal with Iran is on right track/ <http://gulfnews.com/opinions/columnists/nuclear-deal-with-iran-is-on-right-track-1.1254736>) MT

Nonetheless, there is not likely to be any rush to support the deal, since Iran has very few international friends. Therefore, it will take considerable political courage for Obama to go to Congress and the Senate to argue in favour of trusting Tehran, after decades of deep mistrust. It will be a particular challenge that any deal must involve some elements that ensure Iran’s self respect, which will be a red rag to anti-Iranians in Congress and to the Israelis who will mount a fierce counter attack. Obama will be asked to spend a large amount of his dwindling political capital on getting the deal through, just at the time that he has lost control of Congress over the continuing brinkmanship to get the US government budget approved every few months, as well as over intervening in Syria.

#### Congress loves OCO’s

Shaw 12 (New NDAA Would Give the Military Clandestine Cyberwar Powers May 8, 2012 - by Donny Shaw http://www.opencongress.org/articles/view/2492-New-NDAA-Would-Give-the-Military-Clandestine-Cyberwar-Powers)

Remember the 2012 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) and its language “affirming” the military’s power to indefinitely detain anyone, including U.S. citizens, without charge or trial? Well, the 2013 NDAA bill begins its journey through the legislative process tomorrow morning in the House Armed Services Committee; take a look at what power they’ll be trying to affirm for the Defense Department this time around: SEC.941 MILITARY ACTIVITIES IN CYBERSPACE. Section 954 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1551) is amended to read as follows: ‘‘SEC. 954. MILITARY ACTIVITIES IN CYBERSPACE. ‘‘(a) AFFIRMATION.—Congress affirms that the Secretary of Defense is authorized to conduct military activities in cyberspace. ‘‘(b) AUTHORITY DESCRIBED.—The authority referred to in subsection (a) includes the authority to carry out a clandestine operation in cyberspace— ‘‘(1) in support of a military operation pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 107-40) against a target located outside of the United States; or ‘‘(2) to defend against a cyber attack against an asset of the Department of Defense. ‘‘(c ) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary of Defense to conduct military activities in cyberspace.’’. Primary source [here](http://armedservices.house.gov/index.cfm/files/serve?File_id=e7c34102-53e4-455a-b345-358f3e99e8cc) for now. This language is from a just-released chairman’s mark that is not yet available on OC. Congress has already given the Department of Defense some cyberwar powers. Under current law, the DoD can conduct “offensive operations in cyberspace” at the discretion of the President and in the context of a declared war. The new language would expand the DoD’s cyberwar powers by authorizing clandestine operations, removing the requirement for presidential approval, and expanding the authority beyond declared war by authorizing cyberwar actions response to cyberattacks against the military.

#### Deal solves global nuclear war

Edelman, distinguished fellow – Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, ‘11

(Eric S, “The Dangers of a Nuclear Iran,” *Foreign Affairs*, January/February)

The reports of the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States and the Commission on the Prevention Of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism, as well as other analyses, have highlighted the risk that a nuclear-armed Iran could trigger additional nuclear proliferation in the Middle East, even if Israel does not declare its own nuclear arsenal. Notably, Algeria, Bahrain, Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia,Turkey, and the United Arab Emirates— all signatories to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (npt)—have recently announced or initiated nuclear energy programs. Although some of these states have legitimate economic rationales for pursuing nuclear power and although the low-enriched fuel used for power reactors cannot be used in nuclear weapons, these moves have been widely interpreted as hedges against a nuclear-armed Iran. The npt does not bar states from developing the sensitive technology required to produce nuclear fuel on their own, that is, the capability to enrich natural uranium and separate plutonium from spent nuclear fuel. Yet enrichment and reprocessing can also be used to accumulate weapons-grade enriched uranium and plutonium—the very loophole that Iran has apparently exploited in pursuing a nuclear weapons capability. Developing nuclear weapons remains a slow, expensive, and di⁄cult process, even for states with considerable economic resources, and especially if other nations try to constrain aspiring nuclear states’ access to critical materials and technology. Without external support, it is unlikely that any of these aspirants could develop a nuclear weapons capability within a decade.¶ There is, however, at least one state that could receive significant outside support: Saudi Arabia. And if it did, proliferation could accelerate throughout the region. Iran and Saudi Arabia have long been geopolitical and ideological rivals. Riyadh would face tremendous pressure to respond in some form to a nuclear-armed Iran, not only to deter Iranian coercion and subversion but also to preserve its sense that Saudi Arabia is the leading nation in the Muslim world. The Saudi government is already pursuing a nuclear power capability, which could be the first step along a slow road to nuclear weapons development. And concerns persist that it might be able to accelerate its progress by exploiting its close ties to Pakistan. During the 1980s, in response to the use of missiles during the Iran-Iraq War and their growing proliferation throughout the region, Saudi Arabia acquired several dozen css-2 intermediate-range ballistic missiles from China. The Pakistani government reportedly brokered the deal, and it may have also oªered to sell Saudi Arabia nuclear warheads for the css-2s, which are not accurate enough to deliver conventional warheads eªectively. There are still rumors that Riyadh and Islamabad have had discussions involving nuclear weapons, nuclear technology, or security guarantees. This “Islamabad option” could develop in one of several diªerent ways. Pakistan could sell operational nuclear weapons and delivery systems to Saudi Arabia, or it could provide the Saudis with the infrastructure, material, and technical support they need to produce nuclear weapons themselves within a matter of years, as opposed to a decade or longer. Not only has Pakistan provided such support in the past, but it is currently building two more heavy-water reactors for plutonium production and a second chemical reprocessing facility to extract plutonium from spent nuclear fuel. In other words, it might accumulate more fissile material than it needs to maintain even a substantially expanded arsenal of its own. Alternatively, Pakistan might oªer an extended deterrent guarantee to Saudi Arabia and deploy nuclear weapons, delivery systems, and troops on Saudi territory, a practice that the United States has employed for decades with its allies. This arrangement could be particularly appealing to both Saudi Arabia and Pakistan. It would allow the Saudis to argue that they are not violating the npt since they would not be acquiring their own nuclear weapons. And an extended deterrent from Pakistan might be preferable to one from the United States because stationing foreign Muslim forces on Saudi territory would not trigger the kind of popular opposition that would accompany the deployment of U.S. troops. Pakistan, for its part, would gain financial benefits and international clout by deploying nuclear weapons in Saudi Arabia, as well as strategic depth against its chief rival, India. The Islamabad option raises a host of difficult issues, perhaps the most worrisome being how India would respond. Would it target Pakistan’s weapons in Saudi Arabia with its own conventional or nuclear weapons? How would this expanded nuclear competition influence stability during a crisis in either the Middle East or South Asia? Regardless of India’s reaction, any decision by the Saudi government to seek out nuclear weapons, by whatever means, would be highly destabilizing. It would increase the incentives of other nations in the Middle East to pursue nuclear weapons of their own. And it could increase their ability to do so by eroding the remaining barriers to nuclear proliferation: each additional state that acquires nuclear weapons weakens the nonproliferation regime, even if its particular method of acquisition only circumvents, rather than violates, the NPT.¶ n-player competition¶ Were Saudi Arabia to acquire nuclear weapons, the Middle East would count three nuclear-armed states, and perhaps more before long. It is unclear how such an n-player competition would unfold because most analyses of nuclear deterrence are based on the U.S.- Soviet rivalry during the Cold War. It seems likely, however, that the interaction among three or more nuclear-armed powers would be more prone to miscalculation and escalation than a bipolar competition. During the Cold War, the United States and the Soviet Union only needed to concern themselves with an attack from the other. Multipolar systems are generally considered to be less stable than bipolar systems because coalitions can shift quickly, upsetting the balance of power and creating incentives for an attack. More important, emerging nuclear powers in the Middle East might not take the costly steps necessary to preserve regional stability and avoid a nuclear exchange. For nuclear-armed states, the bedrock of deterrence is the knowledge that each side has a secure second-strike capability, so that no state can launch an attack with the expectation that it can wipe out its opponents’ forces and avoid a devastating retaliation. However, emerging nuclear powers might not invest in expensive but survivable capabilities such as hardened missile silos or submarinebased nuclear forces. Given this likely vulnerability, the close proximity of states in the Middle East, and the very short flight times of ballistic missiles in the region, any new nuclear powers might be compelled to “launch on warning” of an attack or even, during a crisis, to use their nuclear forces preemptively. Their governments might also delegate launch authority to lower-level commanders, heightening the possibility of miscalculation and escalation. Moreover, if early warning systems were not integrated into robust command-and-control systems, the risk of an unauthorized or accidental launch would increase further still. And without sophisticated early warning systems, a nuclear attack might be unattributable or attributed incorrectly. That is, assuming that the leadership of a targeted state survived a first strike, it might not be able to accurately determine which nation was responsible. And this uncertainty, when combined with the pressure to respond quickly,would create a significant risk that it would retaliate against the wrong party, potentially triggering a regional nuclear war.

### PPD CP

#### Text: The President of the United States should issue a Presidential Policy Directive that reverses PPD 20.

#### PPDs become part of the law but aren’t perceived in Congress

Bewig, 7-15-13

(Matt Bewig, Graduate Student in History at the University of Florida. “Obama Administration Hiding Details of Presidential Policy Directives” http://www.allgov.com/news/controversies/obama-administration-hiding-details-of-presidential-policy-directives-130715?news=850563) Henge

Despite promising the most transparent administration in history, the Obama White House has actually become more secretive than that of George W. Bush, at least in the area of Presidential Policy Directives (PPDs). Of the more than twenty PPDs issued since Barack Obama took office, only a few have been officially released to the public on the White House website. A PPD, while neither a law nor a regulation, is a statement by the President directed to the Executive Branch of the federal government that implements or interprets a federal statute, a constitutional provision, or a treaty. As such, a PPD becomes part of the particular legal framework that grows up around any statute or program. Keeping it secret means that the public is prevented from fully understanding the laws that govern them. Several of the Obama directives replaced directives issued by the George W. Bush Administration, but while many of the Bush directives were publicly available, their successor directives from President Obama are not.

### Buddhism K

#### The harms of the 1AC are merely subsets of an unawakened anxiety that exists at our core—panic over death prevents us from living

Loy, 3

(David Robert Loy is a professor, writer, and Zen teacher in the Sanbo Kyodan tradition of Japanese Zen Buddhism. “The Great Awakening” pg. 19-20) Henge

“Suffering,” the usual English translation for dukkha, is not very enlightening, especially today, when those of us who live in wealthy countries have many ways to entertain and distract ourselves. The point of the Buddhist term is that we nonetheless experience a basic dissatisfaction, a dis-ease, which continues to fester. That there is something inherently frustrating about our lives is not accidental or coincidental. It is the nature of an unawakened mind to be bothered about something. At the core of our being we feel a free-ﬂoating anxiety, which has no particular object but can plug into any problematic situation. We may try to evade this anxiety by dulling ourselves with alcohol, tobacco or other drugs, television, consumerism, sex, and so forth, or we may become preoccupied with various goals we pursue, but the anxiety is always there; and when we slow down enough to become sensitive to what is occurring in our minds, we become aware of it—which is one reason we do not like to slow down. This implies that everything we normally understand as suffering is only a subset—for some of us a relatively small subset—of dukkha. The Pali sutras distinguish dukkha into three different types.10 The ﬁrst, dukkha-dukkhata, includes everything that we usually think of as suffering: all physical, emotional, and mental pain or discomfort, including being separated from people we like to be with, and being stuck with those we do not. This also includes the types of social dukkha mentioned above. A second and different type is viparinama-dukkhata, the dukkha that arises from impermanence, from knowing that nothing lasts forever and most things do not last long. Even when we are thoroughly enjoying ourselves, we know the moment will not last, and there is something frustrating about that awareness. However delicious that ice cream may taste, we know the last bite is coming soon—and even if we buy another cone, it does not taste as good because we begin to feel sated. The most problematic dukkha of this type is, of course, death: not the physical pain of dying (that is included in the ﬁrst type of dukkha) but the awareness that I will die. This awareness of our inevitable end often pervades and colors everything we do—so thoroughly that it poisons life. Insofar as I am afraid to die, I also become unable to live. To live fully is not possible when we are hypersensitive to the fact that danger and maybe death lurk around every corner, because any little accident could be our last.

#### This anxious egoism makes violence inevitable

Ikeda 07 (Daisaku Ikeda President, Soka Gakkai International January 26, 2007 “Restoring the Human Connection: The First Step to Global Peace” http://www.sgi-usa.org/newsandevents/docs/peace2007.pdf) Dabo

The challenge of preventing any further proliferation of nuclear weapons is just such a trial in the quest for world peace, one that cannot be achieved if we are defeated by a sense of helplessness. The crucial element is to ensure that any struggle against evil is rooted firmly in a consciousness of the unity of the human family, something only gained through the mastery of our own inner contradictions. It is this kind of reconfiguration of our thinking that will make possible a skilled and restrained approach to the options of dialogue and pressure. The stronger our sense of connection as members of the human family, the more effectively we can reduce to an absolute minimum any application of the hard power of pressure, while making the greatest possible use of the soft power of dialogue. Tragically, the weighting in the case of Iraq has been exactly the reverse. The need for such a shift has been confirmed by many of the concerned thinkers I have met. Norman Cousins (1915–90), the writer known as the “conscience of America” with whom I published a dialogue, stated with dismay in his work Human Options: “The great failure of education—not just in the United States but throughout most of the world—is that it has made people tribe-conscious rather than species-conscious.” Similarly, when I met with Mohamed ElBaradei, director general of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), in November of last year, he declared powerfully: “… we continue to emphasize our differences instead of what we have in common. We continue to talk about ‘us’ versus ‘them.’ Only when we can start to talk about ‘us’ as including all of humanity will we truly be at peace….” In our correspondence, Joseph Rotblat posed the question, “Can we master the necessary arts of global security and loyalty to the human race?”9 Three months after writing these words to me, Dr. Rotblat passed away. I believe his choice to leave this most crucial matter in the form of an open question was an expression of his optimism and his faith in humanity. When our thinking is reconfigured around loyalty to the human race—our sense of human solidarity—even the most implacable difficulties will not cause us to lapse into despair or condone the panicked use of force. It will be possible to escape the snares of such shortsighted thinking. We will be empowered to engage in the kind of persistent exertion that Max Weber viewed as the ideal of political action, and the door will be open to the formation of consensus and persuasion through dialogue. The function of anger When my mentor Josei Toda used the words “a devil incarnate, a fiend, a monster,” he was referring to a destructiveness inherent in human life. It is a function of this destructiveness to shred our sense of human solidarity, sowing the seeds of mistrust and suspicion, conflict and hatred. Those who would use nuclear weapons capable of instantaneously killing tens of millions of people exhibit the most desperate symptoms of this pathology. They have lost all sense of the dignity of life, having fallen prey to their own inner demons. Buddhism classifies the underlying destructive impulses that give rise to such behavior as “the three poisons” (Jpn: san-doku) of greed, anger and ignorance. “The world of anger” can be thought of as the state of life of those in whom these forces have been directed outward toward others. Buddhism analyzes the inner state of human life in terms of the following ten categories, or “worlds”: Hell, Hunger, Animality, Anger, Humanity, Rapture, Learning, Realization, Bodhisattva and Buddhahood. Together these worlds constitute an interpenetrating functional whole, referred to as the inherent ten worlds. It is the wisdom and compassion of the world of Buddhahood that bring out the most positive aspect of each of the other worlds. In the Buddhist scriptures we find the statement “anger can function for both good and evil,”10 indicating that just and righteous anger, the kind essential for countering evil, is the form of the world of anger that creates positive value. The anger that we must be on guard against is that which is undirected and unrestrained relative to the other nine worlds. In this case, anger is a rogue and renegade force, disrupting and destroying all in its path. In this form, the world of anger is a condition of “always seeking to surpass, unable to countenance inferiority, disparaging others and overvaluing oneself.” When in the world of anger, we are always engaged in invidious comparisons with others, always seeking to excel over them. The resulting distortions prevent us from perceiving the world accurately; we fall easily into conflict, locking horns with others at the slightest provocation. Under the sway of such anger, people can commit unimaginable acts of violence and bloodshed. Another Buddhist text portrays one in the world of anger as “84,000 yojanas tall, the waters of the four oceans coming only up to his knees.”12 A yojana was a measure of distance used in ancient India; there are various explanations as to what the specific distance may be, but “84,000 yojanas” represents an immeasurable enormity. This metaphor indicates how the self-perception of people in the life-state of anger expands and swells until the ocean deeps would only lap their knees. The inner distortions twisting the heart of someone in this state prevent them from seeing things in their true aspect or making correct judgments. Everything appears as a means or a tool to the fulfillment of egotistical desires and impulses. In inverse proportion to the scale of this inflated arrogance, the existence of others—people, cultures, nature—appears infinitely small and insignificant. It becomes a matter of no concern to harm or even kill others trivialized in this way. It is this state of mind that would countenance the use of nuclear weapons; it can equally be seen in the psychology of those who would advocate the use of such hideously cruel weapons as napalm, or, more recently, depleted uranium and cluster bombs. People in such a state of life are blinded, not only to the horrific suffering their actions wreak but also to the value of human life itself. For the sake of human dignity, we must never succumb to the numbing dehumanization of the rampant world of anger. When the atomic bomb was dropped on the city of Hiroshima, not only military personnel but also many scientists were thrilled by the “success” of this new weapon. However, the consciences of genuinely great scientists were filled with anguish. Einstein greeted this news with an agonized cry of woe, while Rotblat told me he was completely overcome with hopelessness. Their feelings were no doubt intensely resonant with the sentiments that motivated Josei Toda to denounce nuclear weapons. When Toda spoke of “declawing” the demonic nature of nuclear weapons, he had in mind the struggle to prevent the inner forces of anger from disrupting the ten worlds and going on an unrestrained rampage. He was calling for the steady and painstaking work of correctly repositioning and reconfiguring the function of anger in an inner world where wisdom and harmony prevail. This is the true meaning of “declawing.” For SGI members in particular it is thus vital we remember that not only our specific activities for peace and culture but the movement for “human revolution” based on the daily endeavor to transform our lives from within is a consistent and essential aspect of the historic challenge of nuclear disarmament and abolition. Unless we focus on this inner, personal dimension, we will find ourselves overwhelmed by the structural momentum of a technological civilization, which in a certain sense makes inevitable the birth of such demonic progeny as nuclear weapons.

#### The anger and hatred of egoism causes us to view life as hell

Loy, 3

(David Robert Loy is a professor, writer, and Zen teacher in the Sanbo Kyodan tradition of Japanese Zen Buddhism. “The Great Awakening” pg. 7-8) Henge

There are other important dimensions to karma, aside from those pertaining to psychical and bodily rebirth. Whether or not the law of karma is a moral law of the universe—a kind of psychic equivalent to Newton’s third law of motion, that every action has an equal and opposite reaction—the Buddhist emphasis on no-self and intentional action points to a more subtle aspect of karma: that we construct ourselves by what we choose to do. My sense of self is a precipitate of my habitual ways of thinking, feeling, and acting. Just as my body is composed of the food I eat, so my character is built by my conscious decisions. According to this approach, people are “punished” or “rewarded” not for what they have done but for what they have become, and what we intentionally do is what makes us what we are. This does not necessarily involve an afterlife. According to Spinoza, happiness is not the reward of virtue but virtue itself. In more Buddhist terms, we do not live a certain way for the recompense our meritorious actions will bring us, either in this lifetime or in a future one. Rather, to become a different kind of person is to experience the world in a different kind of way. The six realms of samsara have usually been understood as distinct worlds or planes of existence through which we transmigrate according to our karma, yet they can also describe the different ways we experience this world as our attitude toward it changes. The hell realm is not necessarily a place I will be reborn into, due to my hatred and evil actions. It can be the way this world is experienced when my mind is dominated by anger and hate. The twelve interlinked factors of pratitya samutpada (interdependent origination) do not necessarily refer to different lifetimes; that teaching can be understood as describing the various causes and effects of “my” mental processes right now. When karma is understood along these lines, the Buddhist emphasis on our constructedness, instead of being an example of premodern supernatural thinking, becomes quite consistent with the postmodern insight. That does not mean this is the only way to interpret karma and samsara; my reﬂections are merely one example of the possibilities that must be addressed for the contemporary relevance of Buddhism to become more apparent. The challenge, of course, is discriminating between the baby and the bathwater, and that will not be easy. If a contemporary Buddhism is to mature, however, this task cannot be evaded.

#### Vote negative to shed the ego

#### This is a self-transformative recognition of the interpermeation of all beings

Snauwaert, 9

(Dale Snauwaert, University of Toledo. “The Ethics and Ontology of Cosmopolitanism: Education for a Shared Humanity” <http://www.academia.edu/537918/The_Ethics_and_Ontology_of_Cosmopolitanism_Education_for_a_Shared_Humanity>) Henge

Cosmopolitans assert the existence of a duty of moral consideration to all human beings on the basis of a shared humanity. What is universal in, and definitive of, cosmopolitanism is the presupposition of the shared inherent dignity of humanity. As Martha Nussbaum states: [Human good can] be objective in the sense that it is justifiable by reference to reasons that do not derive merely from local traditions and practices, but rather from features of humanness that lie beneath all local traditions and are there to be seen whether or not they are in fact recognized in local traditions. (Perry, 1998, p. 68) If a shared humanity is presupposed, and if humanity is understood to possess an equal inherent value and dignity, then a shared humanity possesses a fundamental moral value. If the fundamental moral value of humanity is acknowledged, then a universal duty of moral consideration follows, for to deny moral consideration to any human being is to ignore (not recognize) their intrinsic value, and thereby, to violate their dignity. The duty of moral consideration in turn morally requires nations and peoples to conduct their relations in accordance with ethical principles that properly instantiate the intrinsic value and dignity of a shared humanity. If valid, the fundamental aims of the education of citizens should be based upon this imperative. In order to further explicate this cosmopolitanism perspective, the philosophy of one of history’s greatest cosmopolitans, Mohandas K. Gandhi, is explored below. Reflections on Gandhi’s Cosmopolitan Philosophy While most commentators focus on Gandhi’s conception and advocacy of nonviolence, it is generally recognized that his core philosophical beliefs regarding the essential unity of humanity and the universal applicability of nonviolence as a moral and political ideal places Gandhi in the cosmopolitan tradition as broadly understood (Iyer, [1973] 1983; Kumar Giri, 2006). At the core of Gandhi’s philosophy are the interdependent values of Satya (Truth) and Ahimsa (nonviolence). Gandhi’s approach to nonviolent social transformation, Satyagraha, is the actualization in action of these two values (Bondurant, 1965; Iyer, [1973] 1983; Naess, 1974). Gandhi’s Satya is multifaceted. Its most fundamental meaning pertains to Truth as self-realization. Satya is derived from sat, Being. Truth is Being; realizing in full awareness one’s authentic Being. Truth, in this sense, is the primary goal of life. Gandhi writes: What I want to achieve . . . is self-realization . . . I live and move and have my being in pursuit of that goal. All that I do by way of speaking and writing, and all my ventures in the political field are directed to this same end. (Naess 1974, p. 35) Self-realization, for Gandhi, requires “shedding the ego,” “reducing one self to zero” (cited in Naess 1974, p. 37). The ego per se is not the real self; it is a fabrication. This egoic self must be transcended. As the egoic self loosens and one becomes increasingly self-aware, one deepens the realization of one’s authentic being, and that being is experienced as unified with humanity and all living things. Scholars normally understand human identity in terms of personality, which is a socially constructed self-concept constituted by a complex network of identifications and object relations. This construction is what we normally refer to as the ego or self-identity. Our egoic self-identity is literally a construction, based upon psychological identifications (Almaas, 1986a, 1986b; Batchelor, 1983). From this perspective, the ego is a socially constructed entity, ultimately a fabrication of the discursive formations of culture; from this point of view, the self is exclusively egoic. This perspective has its origins in the claim that consciousness is solely intentional: the claim that consciousness is always consciousness of some object. From this presupposition, the socially constructed, discursive nature of the self is inferred. If consciousness is solely intentional, then the self is a construction, and, if the self is a construction, then it is always discursive – a pre-discursive self cannot exist. It can be argued, however, that intentionality itself presupposes pre-intentional awareness. A distinction can be made between intentional consciousness and awareness. Intentional consciousness presupposes awareness that is always implicit in intentional consciousness. If intentional consciousness does not presuppose a pre-intentional awareness, if there is only consciousness of, then there is always a knower-known duality, and that duality leads to an infinite regress. To be conscious of an object X, one has to be conscious of one’s consciousness of X, and one would have to be conscious of one’s consciousness of one’s consciousness of X, and one would have to be conscious of one’s consciousness of one’s consciousness of one’s consciousness of X . . . ad infinitum¾reductio ad absurdum. Therefore, there must be implicit in intentional consciousness a level of awareness that is pre-intentional, pre-discursive, and non-positional (Forman, 1999). To be conscious of anything presupposes pre-intentional self-awareness, and being pre-intentional, awareness must be in turn pre-discursive and non-positional (Almaas, 1986a, 1986b; Aurobindo, 1989, 2001; Batchelor, 1983; Buber, 1970; Forman, 1999; Fromm, 1976). When the ego is shed, a pre-discursive, nonpositional self-awareness is revealed. One can be reflexively aware of one’s consciousness. Gandhi held that pre-discursive self-awareness, the core of our being, is unified and interdependent with all living things. He writes: “I believe in the essential unity of man and, for that matter, of all that lives (Naess 1974, p. 43).” In an ontological sense, Gandhi maintains that Satya, Truth, is self-realization, a realization of one’s self-awareness as essentially unified with and thereby existing in solidarity with all human beings and with all living things. Pre-discursive self-awareness is experienced as non-positional, and, being non-positional, it is unbounded; it exists as a field of awareness that is interconnected with all sentient beings. This state is an experience and is only known experientially. Therefore, the assertion of a shared humanity is based upon a common level of being. Human intentional consciousness is expressed in a vast plurality of cultural expressions; implicit within this plurality, existing as its ground, is a shared level of awareness of being that unites us. From the perspective of ontological Truth, nonviolence follows from the unity and interdependence of humanity and life; violence damages all forms of life, including one’s self. Nonviolence uplifts all. Gandhi writes: I do not believe . . . that an individual may gain spiritually and those who surround him suffer. I believe in advaita (non-duality), I believe in the essential unity of man (humankind) and, for that matter, of all that lives. Therefore, I believe that if one man (person) gains spiritually, the whole world gains with him (them) and, if one man (person) falls, the whole world falls to that extent. (Naess 1974, p. 43) In this experience, one becomes aware of the interrelated and interdependent nature of being. On an existential level, there exists a fundamental interconnection between one’s self and other beings. As Buber suggests, “we live in the currents of universal reciprocity (Buber, 1970, p. 67).” From the perspective of this experience—and this is a direct experience—to harm the other is to harm one’s self. From the perspective of existential interconnection, nonviolence, the essence of morality, rests upon an awareness of our fundamental interconnection.

#### Ontological claims come first—they provide the foundation for all claims—the aff’s claims about solving war are rooted in egocentric mind-world dualism

Jackson, 11

(Patrick Thaddeus Jackson, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education and Professor of International Relations in the School of International Service. “The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations” pg. 41-42) Henge

Ontological commitments, whether philosophical or scientific, logically precede substantive claims, and serve as the often-unacknowledged basis on which empirical claims are founded. In this sense, ontological commitments are “founda - tional”—not in the sense that they provide unshakable grounds that universally guarantee the validity of claims that are founded on them, but “foundational” in the sense that they provide the conditions of intelligibility for those claims. In that way, ontological commitments are world-disclosing, since they make a particular kind of tangible world available to a researcher (Habermas 1990, 321). A claim such as “democratic states do not go to war with one another” implicitly makes a number of ontological presuppositions. The claim makes scientific-ontological presupposi - tions that a state’s “democracy-ness” is a conceptually separable attribute of that state and most likely also presupposes that a state’s standing as a democracy is something that is visible to external scholarly observers and specifiable in an abstract fashion.1 The claim also makes philosophical-ontological presuppositions, although these are somewhat further removed from the individual claim and pertain more to the overall intellectual context within which the claim makes sense; hence one needs to know something about the broader body of scholarly literature within which a claim has standing in order to explicate the philosophical-ontological commitments that it tacitly presumes. The academic study of the democratic peace has been almost completely dominated by a neopositivist methodology. Neopositivism, although neutral with respect to the truth-value of specific empirical propositions, sets the contours of the research design within which claims about the democratic peace—and, quite frankly, claims about many of the other empirical phenomena regularly studied within academic IR—are evaluated. Before scholars can engage in debates about whether the democratic peace is best measured and assessed as a dyadic or as a monadic phenomenon (for example, Rousseau et al. 1996), it is first necessary for those scholars to agree on some basic methodological principles, such as the notion that a causal connection shows itself in systematic cross-case correlations between specific factors (in this case, variable attributes such as “being a democ - racy” and “going to war with another democracy”), and the notion that knowledge is constructed through the successive proposing and testing of hypothetical guesses about the character of the world. The fact that these assumptions are so widely shared, both within the democratic peace research community and within the field of IR more generally, does not make them any less philosophical—or any less philosophically contentious. Hypothesis testing and covariation-causality2 are more or less direct consequences of the pair of philosophical-ontological commitments on which neopositivism stands: mind–world dualism and phenomenalism. Mind–world dualism enables hypothesis testing, inasmuch as testing a hypothetical guess to see whether it corresponds to the world makes little sense in the absence of a mind-independent world against which to test that hypothesis. Phenomenalism enables covariation-causality, since the limitation of knowledge to those aspects of the world that can be empirically grasped and directly experienced implies that the only confidence that observers can have about a causal relationship—which must be inferred rather than abduced or counterfactually ideal-typified—must be founded on its systematicity.3 In the absence of these philosophical-ontological commitments, testing hypotheses in order to arrive at reliable statements about robust correlations would make little sense, and if we were interested in knowing about how democracy was connected to questions of war and peace, we would have to engage in some other kinds of knowledge-production procedures. In this chapter I will expand on these claims with an eye to fleshing out the profound interconnections between these two wagers in philosophical ontology and the neopositivist methodological procedures to which they give rise.4 This is somewhat more challenging to do in the case of neopositivism than it is in the other methodologies in my typology, simply because neopositivism is in many ways more commonsensical in IR at the present time than the other philosophical ontologies I am discussing. What is understood among the parties to a conversation need not be explicitly discussed in the course of that conversation—indeed, its not being discussed is a large part of what enables it to work, to use John Searle’s (1995) terminology, in the background of our efforts to make sense of the world— but it does not follow that any particular set of commonsensical presumptions is therefore justified or justifiable. Common sense is by no means conceptually neutral; nor is the content of common sense constant over time. What we, both as a scholarly field and as inhabitants of the planet at the present time, take for granted in conducting our knowledge-producing activities has both a history and a future, and the fact that our history has brought us here does not necessitate, or even prescriptively mandate, that our future look the same way.

### 1NC—Arms Race

#### **US restraint does nothing to stop cyber attacks – its inevitable**

Lewis 2012 James Lewis 12, Director of the Technology and Public Policy Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, “Benefits Are Great, and the Risks Exist Anyway,” Oct 17, NYT, <http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2012/06/04/do-cyberattacks-on-iran-make-us-vulnerable-12/benefits-are-great-and-the-risks-exist-anyway>) MT

Nor do cyberattacks against Iran increase the risk of damaging cyberattacks against the United States. It is true that we are defenseless; efforts to make us safer are hamstrung by self-interest, ideology and the gridlock of American politics. But we are no more vulnerable today than we were the day before the news. If someone decides to attack us, they may cite Iran as precedent, but it will only be to justify a decision they had already made. We could ask whether the United States creates more problems for itself when it makes public a new weapon while potential opponents keep it secret. Four other countries can launch sophisticated and damaging cyber attacks -- including China and Russia -- and plan to use them in warfare. Another 30 nations are acquiring cyber weapons, including Iran and North Korea. There is a very old argument for disarmament that holds that if the United States were to renounce some weapons -- usually nuclear weapons -- the world would be a better place. This utopianism has a revered place in American political thinking, but when humans invent weapons they rarely give them up, especially useful weapons whose components are easy to acquire. Cyberattack is now part of warfare, no different from any other weapon. The publicity around Stuxnet may complicate U.S. efforts to get international rules for the use of cyberattack, but the White House decided that tampering with Iran’s nuclear program was more important than possible risk to slow-moving negotiations. Whether a covert program should remain covert is an operational and political decision -- politics usually wins. Iran was not surprised to learn that the United Sates is using cyberattack, nor was any other major power, and if you think this news is a watershed moment you have been sleeping under a tree.

#### Everything ends, no one is immortal – the affirmative’s resentment of insecurity drives them to attempt and order a safer world

Der Derrian 98 James, Watson Institute research professor of international studies at Brown University, “The Values of Security: Hobbes, Marx, Nietzsche, and Baudrillard”, JSTOR

Nietzsche transvalues both Hobbes's and Marx's interpretations of security through a genealogy of modes of being. His method is not to uncover some deep meaning or value for security, but to destabilize the intolerable fictional identities of the past which have been created out of fear, and to affirm the creative differences which might yield new values for the future. 33 Originating in the paradoxical relationship of a contingent life and a certain death, the history of security reads for Nietzsche as an abnegation, a resentment and, finally, a transcendence of this paradox. In brief, the history is one of individuals seeking an impossible security from the most radical "other" of life, the terror of death which, once generalized and nationalized, triggers a futile cycle of collective identities seeking security from alien others--who are seeking similarly impossible guarantees. It is a story of differences taking on the otherness of death, and identities calcifying into a fearful sameness. Since Nietzsche has suffered the greatest neglect in international theory, his reinterpretation of security will receive a more extensive treatment here. One must begin with Nietzsche's idea of the will to power, which he clearly believed to be prior to and generative of all considerations of security. In Beyond Good and Evil , he emphatically establishes the primacy of the will to power: "Physiologists should think before putting down the instinct of self-preservation as the cardinal instinct of an organic being. A living thing seeks above all to discharge its strength--life itself is will to power; self-preservation is only one of the most frequent results." 34 The will to power, then, should not be confused with a Hobbesian perpetual desire for power. It can, in its negative form, produce a reactive and resentful longing for only power, leading, in Nietzsche's view, to a triumph of nihilism. But Nietzsche refers to a positive will to power, an active and affective force of becoming, from which values and meanings--including self-preservation--are produced which affirm life. Conventions of security act to suppress rather than confront the fears endemic to life, for ". . . life itself is essentially appropriation, injury, overpowering of what is alien and weaker; suppression, hardness, imposition of one's own forms, incorporation and at least, at its mildest, exploitation--but why should one always use those words in which slanderous intent has been imprinted for ages." 35 Elsewhere Nietzsche establishes the pervasiveness of agonism in life: "life is a consequence of war, society itself a means to war." 36 But the denial of this permanent condition, the effort to disguise it with a consensual rationality or to hide from it with a fictional sovereignty, are all effects of this suppression of fear. The desire for security is manifested as a collective resentment of difference--that which is notus, not certain, not predictable.Complicit with a negative will to power is the fear-driven desire for protection from the unknown. Unlike the positive will to power, which produces an aesthetic affirmation of difference, the search for truth produces a truncated life which conforms to the rationally knowable, to the causally sustainable. In The Gay Science , Nietzsche asks of the reader: "Look, isn't our need for knowledge precisely this need for the familiar, the will to uncover everything strange, unusual, and questionable, something that no longer disturbs us? Is it not the instinct of fear that bids us to know? And is the jubilation of those who obtain knowledge not the jubilation over the restoration of a sense of security?" 37 The fear of the unknown and the desire for certainty combine to produce a domesticated life, in which causality and rationality become the highest sign of a sovereign self**,** the surest protection against contingent forces. The fear of fate assures a belief that everything reasonable is true, and everything true, reasonable**.** In short, the security imperative produces, and is sustained by, the strategies of knowledge which seek to explain it. Nietzsche elucidates the nature of this generative relationship in The Twilight of the Idols The causal instinct is thus conditional upon, and excited by, the feeling of fear. The "why?" shall, if at all possible, not give the cause for its own sake so much as for a particular kind of cause --a cause that is comforting, liberating and relieving. . . . That which is new and strange and has not been experienced before, is excluded as a cause. Thus one not only searches for some kind of explanation, to serve as a cause, but for a particularly selected and preferred kind of explanation--that which most quickly and frequently abolished the feeling of the strange, new and hitherto unexperienced: the most habitual explanations. 38 A safe life requires safe truths. The strange and the alien remain unexamined, the unknown becomes identified as evil**,** and evil provokes hostility--recycling the desire for security. The "influence of timidity," as Nietzsche puts it, creates a people who are willing to subordinate affirmative values to the "necessities" of security**:** "they fear change, transitoriness: this expresses a straitened soul, full of mistrust and evil experiences." 39 The unknowable which cannot be contained by force or explained by reason is relegated to the off-world. "Trust," the "good," and other common values come to rely upon an "artificial strength": "the feeling of security such as the Christian possesses; he feels strong in being able to trust, to be patient and composed: he owes this artificial strength to the illusion of being protected by a god." 40 For Nietzsche, of course, only a false sense of security can come from false gods: "Morality and religion belong altogether to the psychology of error : in every single case, cause and effect are confused; or truth is confused with the effects of believing something to be true; or a state of consciousness is confused with its causes." 41

#### Chaos is an intrinsic part of life – the affirmative denies this as it lashes out against the inevitable suffering inherent in existence

Saurette 1996 [Paul, “I mistrust all systemizers and Avoid Them: Nietzsche Arendt and the Crisis of the Will to Order in International Relations Theory, Journal of International Studies vol. 25 No. 1 ]

According to Nietzsche, the philosophical foundation of a society is the set of ideas which give it meaning to the phenomenon of human existence within a given cultural framework. As one manifestation of the Will to Power, this will to meaning fundamentally influences the social and political organization of a particular community. Anything less than a profound historical interrogation of the most basic philosophical foundations of our civilization, then, misconceives the origins of values which we take to be intrinsic and natural. Nietzsche suggests, therefore, to understand the development of our modern conception society and politics, we must reconsider the crucial influence of the platonic formulation of Socratic thought. Nietzsche claims that pre-Socratic Greece based its philosophical justifications of life on heroic myths which honored tragedy and competition. Life was understood as a contest in which both the joyful and ordered (Apollonian) and chaotic and suffering (Dionysian) Aspects of life were accepted and affirmed as inescapable aspects of human existence. However this incarnation of the will to power as a tragedy weakened, and became unable to sustain meaning in Greek life. Greek myths no longer instilled the self-respect and self-control that had upheld the pre-Socratic social order. 'Everywhere the instincts were in anarchy; everywhere people but five steps from excess: the monstrum in animo was a universal danger. No longer willing to accept the tragic hardness and self-mastery of pre-Socratic myth, Greek thought yielded to decadence a search for a new social foundation which would soften the tragedy of life. While still giving meaning to existence. In this context, Socrates' thought became paramount. In the words of Nietzsche, Socrates Saw behind his aristocratic Athenians; he grasped that his case, the idiosyncrasy of his case, was no longer exceptional. The same kind of denigration was everywhere silently preparing itself: the old Athens was coming to an end. And Socrates understood that the world had no need of him – his expedient, his cure and his personal art of self-preservation. Socrates realized that his search for an ultimate and eternal intellectual standard paralleled the widespread yearnings for assurance and stability within society. His expedient, his cure? An Alternative will to power. An Alternate Foundation that promised mastery and control, not through acceptance of the tragic life, but through the disavowal of the instinctual, the contingent and the problematic. In response to the failing power of its foundational myths, greece tried to renounce the very experience that had given rise to tragedy by retreating /escaping into the Apollonian world promised by Socratic reason. In Nietzsche's words, '[r]ationality was divined as a savior... it was their last expedient. The fanaticism with which the whole of Greek thought throws itself at rationality betrays a state of emergency : one was peril, one had only one choice: either to perish or be absurdly rational...” Thus Socrates codified the wider fear of instability into an intellectual framework. The Socratic Will to Truth is characterized by the attempt to understand and order life rationally by renouncing the Dionysian elements of existence and privileging an idealized Apollonian order. As life is inescapably comprised of both order and disorder, however, the promise of control through Socratic reason is only possibly by creating a 'Real World' of eternal and meaningful forms, in opposition to an 'Apparent World' of transitory physical existence. Suffering and Contingency is contained within the apparent world, disparaged, devalued and ignored in relation to the ideal order of the real world. Essential to the Socratic will to truth, then, is the fundamental contradiction between the experience of Dionysian suffering in the apparent world and the idealized order of the Real World. According to Nietzsche, this dichotomized model lead to the emergence of a uniquely 'modern' understanding of life in which one could only view suffering as the result of an imperfection of the apparent world. This outlook created a modern notion of responsibility in which the Dionysian elements of life could be understood only as a phenomenon for which someone or something is to blame. Nietzsche terms this philosophically induced condition ressentiment. And argues that it signaled a potential crisis of the Will to Truth by exposing the central contradiction of the Socratic resolution. This contradiction however, was resolved historically through the aggressive universalisation of the Socratic ideal by Christianity. According to Nietzsche, acetic Christianity exacerbated the Socratic dichotomization by employing the Apparent World as the responsible agent against which the ressentiment of life could be turned. Blame for suffering fell on individuals within the apparent world, precisely because they did not live up to god, the Truth and the Real World. As Nietzsche wrote, 'I suffer: someone must be to blame for it' thinks every sickly sheep. But his shepherd, the ascetic priest tells him: 'quite easy so my sheep! Someone must be to blame for it but you yourself are this someone, you are alone are to blame for yourself. You are alone are to blame for yourself – this is brazen and false enough: but one thing is achieved by it, the direction of ressentiment is altered. Faced with the collapse of the Socratic resolution and the prospects of meaninglessness, once again, 'one was in peril, one had only one choice: either to perish or be absurdly rational...” the genius of the ascetic ideal was that it preserved the meaning of the Socratic will to power as the Will to Truth by extrapolating ad absurdium the Socratic division through this reduction. The real world was transformed from a transcendental world of philosophical escapes into a model towards which the apparent world actively aspired always blaming its contradictory experiences on its own imperfect knowledge and action. This subtle transformation of the relationship between the dichotomized worlds creates the Will to Order as the defining characteristic of the modern Will to truth. Unable to accept the Dionysian suffering inherent in the Apparent World, the ascetic ressentiment desperately searches for the 'hypnotic sense of nothingness, the repose of deepest sleep, in short absence of suffering'. According to the ascetic model, however, this escape is possibly only when the apparent world perfectly duplicates the Real World. The will to Order then is the aggressive need increasingly to order the Apparent world in line with the precepts of the moral Truth of the Real World. The ressentiment of the will to order therefore generates two interrelated reactions. First, the ressentiment engenders a need actively to mould the Apparent World in accordance with the dictates of the ideal, Apollonian Real World. In order to achieve this, however, the acetic ideal also asserts that a truer more complete knowledge of the Real World must be established, creating an ever-increasing will to truth. This self-perpetuating movement creates an interpretive structure within which everything must be understood and ordered in relation to the ascetic truth of the real world as Nietzsche suggests.

#### The affirmative’s obsession with perfection is life-negating – the eternal struggle against entropy reduces life to mere empty existence

Kain 7, professor of philosophy at Santa Clara, 2007 [Philip J., “Nietzsche, Eternal Recurrence, and the Horror of Existence,” Journal of Nietzsche Studies 33 (2007), 49-63]

Why is it best never to have been born? Because all we can expect as human beings is to suffer. Yet, still, this is not precisely the problem. As Nietzsche tells us in On the Genealogy of Morals, human beings can live with suffering. What they cannot live with is meaningless suffering—suffering for no reason at all (GM III:28). In Nietzsche's view we are "surrounded by a fearful void . . ." (GM III:28; cf. WP 55). We live in an empty, meaningless cosmos. We cannot look into reality without being overcome. Indeed, in Beyond Good and Evil, Nietzsche even suggests that "it might be a basic characteristic of existence that those who would know it completely would perish . . ." (BGE 39; cf. WP 822). And it was not just intellectual reflection that led Nietzsche to a belief in the horror of existence. He lived it himself.2 In a letter of April 10, 1888, he writes: "Around 1876 my health grew worse. . . . There were extremely painful and obstinate headaches which exhausted all my strength. They increased over long years, to reach a climax at which pain was habitual, so that any given year contained for me two hundred days of pain. . . . My specialty was to endure the extremity of pain . . . with complete lucidity for two or three days in succession, with continuous vomiting of mucus."3 In Nietzsche contra Wagner, he tells us how significant this suffering was for him: I have often asked myself whether I am not much more deeply indebted to the hardest years of my life than to any others. . . . And as to my prolonged illness, [End P0age 49] do I not owe much more to it than I owe to my health? To it I owe a higher kind of health, a sort of health which grows stronger under everything that does not actually kill it!—To it, I owe even my philosophy. . . . Only great suffering is the ultimate emancipator of the spirit. . . . Only great suffering; that great suffering, under which we seem to be over a fire of greenwood, the suffering that takes its time—forces us philosophers to descend into our nethermost depths. . . .  (NCW "Epilogue") Nietzsche's belief in the horror of existence is largely, if not completely, overlooked by most scholars.4 I hope to show that it had a profound effect on his thought, indeed, that he cannot be adequately understood without seeing the centrality of this concept. To begin to understand its importance, let us consider three different visions of the human condition. The first holds that we live in a benign cosmos. It is as if it were purposively planned for us and we for it. We fit, we belong, we are at home in this cosmos. We are confirmed and reinforced by it. Our natural response is a desire to know it and thus to appreciate our fit into it. Let us call this the designed cosmos. Roughly speaking, this is the traditional view held by most philosophers from Plato and Aristotle through the medievals. And for the most part it has disappeared in the modern world—few really believe in it anymore.  The second vision backs off from the assumptions required by the first. This view started with Francis Bacon, if not before, and it is the view of most moderns. Here the cosmos is neither alien nor designed for us. It is neither terrifying nor benign. The cosmos is neutral and, most importantly, malleable. Human beings must come to understand the cosmos through science and control it through technology. We must make it fit us. It does not fit us by design. We must work on it, transform it, and mold it into a place where we can be at home. We must create our own place. For these modern thinkers, we end up with more than the ancients and medievals had. We end up with a fit like they had, but we get the added satisfaction of bringing it about ourselves, accomplishing it through our own endeavor, individuality, and freedom. Let us call this the perfectible cosmos. The third vision takes the cosmos to be alien. It was not designed for human beings at all; nor were they designed for it. We just do not fit. We do not belong. And we never will. The cosmos is horrible, terrifying, and we will never surmount this fact. It is a place where human beings suffer for no reason at all. It is best never to have been born. Let us call this the horrific cosmos. This is Nietzsche's view. Nietzsche simply dismisses the designed cosmos, which few believe in anymore anyway (WP 12a). On the other hand, Nietzsche takes the perfectible cosmos very seriously. He resists it with every fiber of his being.5 For Nietzsche, we must stop wasting time and energy hoping to change things, improve them, make progress (see, e.g., WP 40, 90, 684)—the outlook of liberals, socialists, and even Christians, all of whom Nietzsche tends to lump together and excoriate. For [End Page 50] Nietzsche, we cannot reduce suffering, and to keep hoping that we can will simply weaken us. Instead, we must conceal an alien and terrifying cosmos if we hope to live in it. And we must develop the strength to do so. We must toughen ourselves. We need more suffering, not less. It has "created all enhancements of man so far . . ." (BGE 225, 44; WP 957; GM II:7). If we look deeply into the essence of things, into the horror of existence, Nietzsche thinks we will be overwhelmed—paralyzed. Like Hamlet we will not be able to act, because we will see that action cannot change the eternal nature of things (BT 7). We must see, Nietzsche says, that "a profound illusion . . . first saw the light of the world in the person of Socrates: the unshakeable faith that thought . . . can penetrate the deepest abysses of being, and that thought is capable not only of knowing being but even of correcting it. This sublime metaphysical illusion accompanies science as an instinct . . ." (BT 15). In Nietzsche's view, we cannot change things. Instead, with Hamlet we should "feel it to be ridiculous or humiliating that [we] should be asked to set right a world that is out of joint" (BT 7; cf. TI "Anti-Nature," 6). Knowledge of the horror of existence kills action—which requires distance and illusion. The horror and meaninglessness of existence must be veiled if we are to live and act. What we must do, Nietzsche thinks, is construct a meaning for suffering. Suffering we can handle. Meaningless suffering, suffering for no reason at all, we cannot handle. So we give suffering a meaning. We invent a meaning. We create an illusion. The Greeks constructed gods for whom wars and other forms of suffering were festival plays and thus an occasion to be celebrated by the poets. Christians imagine a God for whom suffering is punishment for sin (GM II:7; cf. D 78). One might find all this unacceptable. After all, isn't it just obvious that we can change things, reduce suffering, improve existence, and make progress? Isn't it just obvious that modern science and technology have done so? Isn't it just absurd for Nietzsche to reject the possibility of significant change? Hasn't such change already occurred? Well, perhaps not. Even modern environmentalists might resist all this obviousness. They might respond in a rather Nietzschean vein that technology may have caused as many problems as it has solved. The advocate of the perfectible cosmos, on the other hand, would no doubt counter such Nietzschean pessimism by arguing that even if technology does cause some problems, the solution to those problems can only come from better technology. Honesty requires us to admit, however, that this is merely a hope, not something for which we already have evidence, not something that it is absurd to doubt—not at all something obvious. Further technology may or may not improve things. The widespread use of antibiotics seems to have done a miraculous job of improving our health and reducing suffering, but we are also discovering that such antibiotics give rise to even more powerful bacteria that are immune to those [End Page 51] antibiotics. We have largely eliminated diseases like cholera, smallpox, malaria, and tuberculosis, but we have produced cancer and heart disease. We can cure syphilis and gonorrhea, but we now have AIDS. Even if we could show that it will be possible to continuously reduce suffering, it is very unlikely that we will ever eliminate it. If that is so, then it remains a real question whether it is not better to face suffering, use it as a discipline, perhaps even increase it, so as to toughen ourselves, rather than let it weaken us, allow it to dominate us, by continually hoping to overcome it. But whatever we think about the possibility of reducing suffering, the question may well become moot. Nietzsche tells a story: "Once upon a time, in some out of the way corner of that universe which is dispersed into numberless twinkling solar systems, there was a star upon which clever beasts invented knowing. That was the most arrogant and mendacious minute of 'world history,' but nevertheless, it was only a minute. After nature had drawn a few breaths, the star cooled and congealed, and the clever beasts had to die" (TL 1, 79). Whatever progress we might think we are making in reducing suffering, whatever change we think we are bringing about, it may all amount[s] to nothing more than a brief and accidental moment in biological time, whose imminent disappearance will finally confirm the horror and meaninglessness of existence. The disagreement here is not so much about the quantity of suffering that we can expect to find in the world but, rather, its nature. For proponents of the designed cosmos, suffering is basically accidental. It is not fundamental or central to life. It is not a necessary part of the nature of things. It does not make up the essence of existence. We must develop virtue, and then we can basically expect to fit and be at home in the cosmos. For the proponents of a perfectible cosmos, suffering is neither essential nor unessential. The cosmos is neutral. We must work on it to reduce suffering. We must bring about our own fit. For Nietzsche, even if we can change this or that, even if we can reduce suffering here and there, what cannot be changed for human beings is that suffering is fundamental and central to life. The very nature of things, the very essence of existence, means suffering. Moreover, it means meaningless suffering—suffering for no reason at all. That cannot be changed—it can only be concealed.

### 1NC—Trade Off

#### **Cyber war inevitable**

Hypponen 2012 Mikko Hypponen 12, an authority on cybercrime and one of Foreign Policy’s ‘Top 100 Global Thinkers,’ is the chief research officer at F-Secure Corporation, “A Pandora’s Box We Will Regret Opening,” June 5, NYT, http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2012/06/04/do-cyberattacks-on-iran-make-us-vulnerable-12/a-pandoras-box-we-will-regret-opening

If somebody would have told me five years ago that by 2012 it would be commonplace for countries to launch cyberattacks against each other, I would not have believed it. If somebody would have told me that a Western government would be using cybersabotage to attack the nuclear program of another government, I would have thought that's a Hollywood movie plot. Yet, that's exactly what's happening, for real. Cyberattacks have several advantages over traditional espionage or sabotage. Cyber attacks are effective, cheap and deniable. This is why governments like them. In fact, if Obama administration officials would not have leaked the confirmation that the U.S. government (together with the Israelis) was behind Stuxnet, we probably would have never known for sure. Other nations will now follow suit, but the U.S, has the most to lose. No other country has so much of its economy linked online. In that sense, it's a bit surprising that the U.S. government seems to have taken the credit ­ and the blame ­ for Stuxnet. Why did they do it? The most obvious answer seems to be that it's an election year and the voters like to see the president as taking on adversaries like Iran. But we don't really know.

#### Econ high now

CNBC 11/15 (Consumer News and Business Channel, “US Stock futures retain mild gains after weak economic reports”, <http://www.cnbc.com/id/101201432>, Saav)

U.S. stock-index futures held modest gains on Friday after data had export prices falling more than expected and a gauge of manufacturing in the New York region slipping. Stock futures eased their advance only slightly in the wake of the reports, one of which had prices for U.S. exports unexpectedly falling in October, while the costs of imports into the United States also fell as a result of a steep fall in oil prices. Export prices fell 0.5 percent last month, the Labor Department said. Another report, the New York manufacturing survey, came in minus 2.2 for November, also below estimates. Stocks rose on Thursday, lifting the S&P 500 and Dow industrials to record finishes, following dovish remarks from U.S. Federal Reserve Vice Chair Janet Yellen, who is on course to become the central bank's next chairman. Asian and European equity markets rallied on Friday as investors cheered remarks from Yellen, who is set to replace Ben Bernanke in January, that the U.S.' monetary stimulus program would remain in place for now. At her confirmation hearing before the Senate Banking Committee on Thursday, Janet Yellen said the central bank was not going to reduce its stimulus program anytime soon as she voiced concern about the economy, sluggish job growth and the low inflation rate. Overall, she was viewed as dovish and very much aligned with Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke. Micheal Hewson, chief market analyst at CMC Markets, warned Friday that markets should not get carried away in their belief that the "Bernanke "put" would be replaced by the Yellen "put."

#### The US economy is resilient – European crisis proves

Rosenau, 11

(11-22-11. Pamela Rosenau is Managing Director & Equity Market Strategist at HighTower; Co-Chair of the Steering Committee of HighTower Group Investment Solutions; and Chief Investment Officer of the Rosenau/Paul Group. “Common Sense is Uncommon: Our Hidden Economic Resilience” <http://www.advisorperspectives.com/commentaries/hightower_112211.php>) Henge

The U.S. stock market has shown a certain toughness despite all the noise surrounding Europe. In fact, despite Europe constituting a large piece of the foreign revenues for the U.S. market, the S&P 500 is down just 1.5% this year, outperforming other world indices, many of which are down double digits (note 1). Although the European crisis may continue to add some volatility in the U.S., the influence of Europe appears to be overestimated. At the heart of the S&P 500’s outperformance has been our improving domestic economy. Although some of these signs of improvement are being ignored, recent economic data, which has been better than expected, should make investors feel much more optimistic than their current despondent state. In the labor market, for example, weekly jobless claims have declined to 388k, which is the best reading since early 2011. Interestingly, much of the incremental job growth has been fueled by the housing sector, one of the key drivers of the US economy. (note 2) Also, the Citigroup Economic Surprise Index has been climbing to its latest level of 49.9, or the best reading since March 2011. JP Morgan analyst, Thomas Lee, notes that we can see “the elements of a year-end rally in place” as we not only enjoy better economic data, but enormous liquidity, investor underperformance, attractive valuations and a positive seasonal effect. (note 3) Importantly, these are all elements that have little to do with Europe. In short, although Europe continues to face problems, the US economic momentum remains strong and I would expect this to translate into a year-end rally. According to the USDA, GDP estimates for 2011 reflect that the U.S. has been maintaining (for nearly forty years!) its share of world GDP, which is currently 26%, and actually higher than it was in 1982 (25.8%). (note 4) According to economist Mark Perry, the fact that it has “remained constant over time is a testament to how America’s dynamism, resiliency, and culture of innovation and entrepreneurship have enabled us to continue to be productive and competitive.” (note 5) A key engine of growth in the U.S. has come from our exports. Recent data has shown that the Los Angeles Port reached a record for shipments in October, which reflects the demand for U.S. products in an expanding global market. The global economy has also hit new highs as real world GDP exceeded $50 trillion for the first time ever this year. (note 6) Another positive signal for the U.S. market comes from the relative outperformance of regional banks over money center banks, which trade derivatives (including credit default swaps) and execute currency swaps with large European banks. So far this year, the regional bank ETF (KRE) has outperformed the S&P bank ETF (KBE, which includes the money centers) by nearly 15 percent.(note 7) Tim Hayes, strategist at Ned Davis Research, was quoted in Barron’s stating “that continuing evidence of economic resilience (which was much in evidence last week in the housing, retail, unemployment-claims and leading-indicators data) should confirm the stock market's refusal (so far) to buckle all together.”(note 8) He also added that “investor worry is a positive condition. The market says it wants to go higher." Investor fear, however, still permeates the market. Wolfe Trahan recently highlighted that there has been a wide divergence between the equity markets and economic surprises. (note 9) The market rallied in October on the back of stronger economic data, which is reflected when comparing the trends of the Citigroup Economic Surprise Index with the MSCI World Equity Index. Recently, however, both indices have diverged as fears surrounding Europe have overwhelmed the market, thus temporarily drowning out any positive economic data. Eventually, the two will converge. People are afraid of a contagion, yet the S&P this year has even outperformed the Russell 2000, consisting of domestically focused small caps. The widespread fear by the investment community is driven by the recency effect of the excessive losses in 2008 and by the “group think” mentality that is so prevalent today. An example of this consensus thinking was captured recently by Barron’s columnist Michael Santoli as he wrote, “When your ‘stop-loss’ order matches that of so many others, it becomes a ‘start-loss’ order.” (note 10) Essentially, “stop-loss” is mislabeled as it does not necessarily offer protection, but may add to the probability of downside loss. Overall, investors continue to focus on the wrong factors. If one thing has become clear these days, macro factors increasingly determine the valuations at the micro level. Although the valuation of individual stocks used to determine the value of the market as a whole, stock selection is now subordinate to asset allocation. Even Bill Miller, the ultimate bottom-up investor, is going to lose his job after thirty years at the helm of Legg Mason Value Trust. Investors need to begin to focus on the positive signals that the market is sending us--better economic data will be a boon for the U.S. stock market.

#### The economy is subject to a cycle of growth and decline – disproves the impact or makes it inevitable

Morley and Piger, 9

(James Morley, Department of Economics at Washington University in St. Louis. Jeremy Piger, Department of Economics at the University of Oregon. “The Asymmetric Business Cycle” <http://nber-nsf09.ucdavis.edu/program/papers/piger.pdf>) Henge

In macroeconomics, fluctuations in economic activity are typically classified into three main categories: long-run growth, the business cycle, and seasonal patterns. These different sources of fluctuations may in fact be related to each other, but it can be useful to make some distinction between them. In this paper, we follow standard practice by considering seasonally adjusted data. This implicitly treats the seasonal patterns as independent or, at least, not marginally relevant for making inferences about long-run growth or business cycles, although we note the existence of an interesting literature on the influence of seasonal fluctuations on business cycles (see, for example, Wen, 2002). So, what is the “business cycle” as distinct from long-run growth? One notion that has been put forth by the NBER is that the business cycle corresponds to an alternation between relatively persistent phases of expansion and recession in economic activity that occur despite the positive average growth of economic activity in most industrialized countries. We refer to this notion of the business cycle as the ‘alternating-phases’ definition. One problem with this notion is that it is far from universal. Some countries have experienced many consecutive years of positive growth in the level of economic activity and thus have no business cycles in the strict NBER sense (e.g., Japan in the early postwar period). A more general notion of the business cycle is that it corresponds to all short-run fluctuations in economic activity (again, beyond seasonal movements), without a distinction made between whether they correspond to an increase or outright decline in activity. The problem with this definition is that it merely labels the analysis of higher-frequency variation in economic activity as “business cycle analysis”, without saying whether there is anything meaningful about the business cycle as a macroeconomic phenomenon. For example, this notion begs the question of why any attention is paid to whether the NBER deems there to be a recession or not. A third notion of the business cycle is that it represents the transitory fluctuations of the economy around a long-run or “trend” level. In this paper, we argue that this ‘output-gap’ definition provides the most useful notion of the business cycle.1 It implies a construct—the transitory component of real economic activity—that can be measured for any economy and is potentially useful for forecasting, policymaking, and theory. We emphasize that there is nothing about this notion of the business cycle that implies it is independent of long-run growth. Transitory fluctuations could be due to the same factors that drive long-run growth or they could be due to independent factors. It is ultimately an empirical question how important these different underlying factors are. Indeed, it is an empirical question as to whether the transitory component of economic activity is relevant for anything. Later in this paper, we provide some analysis that suggests it is. Furthermore, we find in measuring the transitory component for the U.S. economy that it displays large negative movements during NBER-dated recessions, suggesting a direct link between the ‘alternating-phases’ and ‘output-gap’ definitions of the business cycle.

#### No risk or impact to economic decline

Drezner ‘11 Daniel W. Drezner, professor of international politics at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, “Please come down off the ledge, dear readers,” Foreign Policy, 8/12/11, http://drezner.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/08/12/please\_come\_down\_off\_the\_ledge\_dear\_readers

So, when we last left off this debate, things were looking grim. My concern in the last post was that the persistence of hard times would cause governments to take actions that would lead to a collapse of the open global economy, a spike in general riots and disturbances, and eerie echoes of the Great Depression. Let's assume that the global economy persists in sputtering for a while, because that's what happens after major financial shocks. Why won't these other bad things happen? Why isn't it 1931? Let's start with the obvious -- it's not gonna be 1931 because there's some passing familiarity with how 1931 played out. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve has devoted much of his academic career to studying the Great Depression. I'm gonna go out on a limb therefore and assert that if the world plunges into a another severe downturn, it's not gonna be because central bank heads replay the same set of mistakes. The legacy of the Great Depression has also affected public attitudes and institutions that provide much stronger cement for the current system. In terms of [public] attitudes, compare the results of this mid-2007 poll with this mid-2010 poll about which economic system is best. I'll just reproduce the key charts below: The headline of the 2010 results is that there's eroding U.S. support for the global economy, but a few other things stand out. U.S. support has declined, but it's declined from a very high level. In contrast, support for free markets has increased in other major powers, such as Germany and China. On the whole, despite the worst global economic crisis since the Great Depression, public attitudes have not changed all that much. While there might be populist demands to "do something," that something is not a return to autarky or anything so [drastic]. Another big difference is that multilateral economic institutions are much more robust now than they were in 1931. On trade matters, even if the Doha round is dead, the rest of the World Trade Organization's corpus of trade-liberalizing measures are still working quite well. Even beyond the WTO, the complaint about trade is not the deficit of free-trade agreements but the surfeit of them. The IMF's resources have been strengthened as a result of the 2008 financial crisis. The Basle Committee on Banking Supervision has already promulgated a plan to strengthen capital requirements for banks. True, it's a slow, weak-assed plan, but it would be an improvement over the status quo. As for the G-20, I've been pretty skeptical about that group's abilities to collectively address serious macroeconomic problems. That is setting the bar rather high, however. One could argue that the G-20's most useful function is reassurance. Even if there are disagreements, communication can prevent them from growing into anything worse. Finally, a note about the possibility of riots and other general social unrest. The working paper cited in my previous post noted the links between austerity measures and increases in disturbances. However, that paper contains the following important paragraph on page 19: [I]n countries with better institutions, the responsiveness of unrest to budget cuts is generally lower. Where constraints on the executive are minimal, the coefficient on expenditure changes is strongly negative -- more spending buys a lot of social peace. In countries with Polity-2 scores above zero, the coefficient is about half in size, and less significant. As we limit the sample to ever more democratic countries, the size of the coefficient declines. For full democracies with a complete range of civil rights, the coefficient is still negative, but no longer significant. This is good news!! The world has a hell of a lot more democratic governments now than it did in 1931. What happened in London, in other words, might prove to be the exception more than the rule. So yes, the recent economic news might seem grim. Unless political institutions and public attitudes buckle, however, we're unlikely to repeat the mistakes of the 1930's. And, based on the data we've got, that's not going to happen.

## 2NC—Buddhism

### 2NC—Assorted DAs [FW]

#### Chaos DA—policymakers’ attempts to impose order and certainty on the world result in constant war and violence

Burke in 2007

(Anthony, Senior Lecturer in Politics and International Relations at UNSW, Sydney, “Ontologies of War: Violence, Existence and Reason”, Theory & Event, Volume 10, Issue 2, 2007, pMUSE, cheek)

# At the same time, **Kissinger's hubris and hunger for control was beset by a corrosive anxiety: that, in an era of nuclear weapons proliferation and constant military modernisation**, of geopolitical stalemate in Vietnam, and the emergence and militancy of new post-colonial states, **order and mastery were harder to define and impose**. He worried over the way 'military bipolarity' between the superpowers had 'encouraged political multipolarity', which 'does not guarantee stability. **Rigidity is diminished, but so is manageability...equilibrium is difficult to achieve among states widely divergent in values, goals, expectations and previous experience'** (emphasis added). He mourned that 'the greatest need of the contemporary international system is an agreed concept of order'.57 **Here were the driving obsessions of the modern rational statesman based around a hunger for stasis and certainty that would entrench U.S. hegemony**: For the two decades after 1945, our international activities were based on the assumption that technology plus managerial skills gave us the ability to reshape the international system and to bring about domestic transformations in "emerging countries". This direct "operational" concept of international order has proved too simple. **Political multipolarity makes it impossible to impose an American design.** Our deepest challenge will be to evoke the creativity of a pluralistic world, to base order on political multipolarity even though overwhelming military strength will remain with the two superpowers.58 **Kissinger's statement revealed that such cravings for order and certainty continually confront chaos, resistance and uncertainty: clay that won't be worked, flesh that will not yield, enemies that refuse to surrender. This is one of the most powerful lessons of the Indochina wars, which were to continue in a phenomenally destructive fashion for six years after Kissinger wrote these words.** Yet as his sinister, Orwellian exhortation to 'evoke the creativity of a pluralistic world' demonstrated, Kissinger's hubris was undiminished. This is a vicious, historic irony: a desire to control nature, technology, society and human beings that is continually frustrated, but never abandoned or rethought. By 1968 U.S. Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, the rationalist policymaker par excellence, had already decided that U.S. power and technology could not prevail in Vietnam; **Nixon and Kissinger's refusal to accept this conclusion, to abandon their Cartesian illusions, was to condemn hundreds of thousands more to die in Indochina and the people of Cambodia to two more decades of horror and misery**.59 In 2003 there would be a powerful sense of déja vu as another Republican Administration crowned more than decade of failed and destructive policy on Iraq with a deeply controversial and divisive war to remove Saddam Hussein from power. **In this struggle with the lessons of Vietnam, revolutionary resistance, and rapid geopolitical transformation, we are witness to an enduring political and cultural theme: of a craving for order, control and certainty in the face of continual uncertainty. Closely related to this anxiety was the way that Kissinger's thinking -- and that of McNamara and earlier imperialists** like the British Governor of Egypt Cromer -- **was embedded in instrumental images of technology and the machine: the machine as both a tool of power and an image of social and political order**. In his essay 'The Government of Subject Races' Cromer envisaged effective imperial rule -- over numerous societies and billions of human beings -- as best achieved by a central authority working 'to ensure the harmonious working of the different parts of the machine'.60 **Kissinger analogously invoked the virtues of 'equilibrium', 'manageability' and 'stability' yet, writing some six decades later, was anxious that technological progress no longer brought untroubled control: the Westernising 'spread of technology and its associated rationality**...**does not inevitably produce a similar concept of reality'**.61 # **We sense the rational policymaker's frustrated desire: the world is supposed to work like a machine, ordered by a form of power and governmental reason which deploys machines and whose desires and processes are meant to run along ordered, rational lines like a machine**. Kissinger's desire was little different from that of Cromer who, wrote Edward Said: ...envisions a seat of power in the West and radiating out from it towards the East a great embracing machine, sustaining the central authority yet commanded by it. What the machine's branches feed into it from the East -- human material, material wealth, knowledge, what have you -- is processed by the machine, then converted into more power...the immediate translation of mere Oriental matter into useful substance.62 # **This desire for order in the shadow of chaos and uncertainty** -- **the constant war with an intractable and volatile matter -- has deep roots in modern thought, and was a major impetus to the development of technological reason and its supporting theories of knowledge**. As Kissinger's claims about **the West's Newtonian desire for the 'accurate' gathering and classification of 'data' suggest, modern strategy, foreign policy and Realpolitik have been thrust deep into the apparently stable soil of natural science, in the hope of finding immovable and unchallengeable roots there**. While this process has origins in ancient Judaic and Greek thought, it crystallised in philosophical terms most powerfully during and after the Renaissance. The key figures in this process were Francis Bacon, Galileo, Isaac Newton, and René Descartes, who all combined a hunger for political and ontological certainty, a positivist epistemology and a naïve faith in the goodness of invention. Bacon sought to create certainty and order, and with it a new human power over the world, through a new empirical methodology based on a harmonious combination of experiment, the senses and the understanding. With this method, he argued, we can 'derive hope from a purer alliance of the faculties (the experimental and rational) than has yet been attempted'.63 In a similar move, **Descartes sought to conjure certainty from uncertainty through the application of a new method that moved progressively out from a few basic certainties (the existence of God, the certitude of individual consciousness and a divinely granted faculty of judgement) in a search for pure fixed truths**. Mathematics formed the ideal image of this method, with its strict logical reasoning, its quantifiable results and its uncanny insights into the hidden structure of the cosmos.64 Earlier, Galileo had argued that scientists should privilege 'objective', quantifiable qualities over 'merely perceptible' ones; that 'only by means of an exclusively quantitative analysis could science attain certain knowledge of the world'.65 **Such doctrines of mathematically verifiable truth were to have powerful echoes in the 20th Century, in the ascendancy of systems analysis, game theory, cybernetics and computing in defense policy and strategic decisions, and in the awesome scientific breakthroughs of nuclear physics**, **which unlocked the innermost secrets of matter and energy and applied the most advanced applications of mathematics and computing to create the atomic bomb.** Yet this new scientific power was marked by a terrible irony: **as even Morgenthau understood, the control over matter afforded by the science could never be translated into the control of the weapons themselves, into political utility and rational strategy**.66

### 2NC—Link

#### The self cannot grasp itself, thus we attach our anxiety to things to ground ourselves in the world—things like ideologies and actions

Loy, 3

(David Robert Loy is a professor, writer, and Zen teacher in the Sanbo Kyodan tradition of Japanese Zen Buddhism. “The Great Awakening” pg. 21-23) Henge

That third type is sankhara-dukkhata, dukkha “from conditioned states,” although in this case the meaning is not as clear in the early Buddhist texts. “Conditioned states” apparently refers to the skandhas, the ﬁve components of the self—or, more precisely, those physical and mental processes whose interaction creates our sense of self. So this dukkha has something to do with the doctrine of anatta, the strange but essential Buddhist claim that our sense of subjectivity does not correspond to any real ontological self—or in the (post)modern terms I have been using, the claim that the sense of self is a construct. Contemporary psychology makes such a doctrine seem somewhat less perverse by providing some homegrown handles on what remains a very counterintuitive claim. In this regard Buddhism seems to have anticipated the more recent and reluctant conclusions of psychoanalysis: guilt and anxiety are not adventitious but intrinsic to the ego. Anatta suggests that our dukkha ultimately derives from a repression even more immediate than death-fear: the suspicion that I am not real. For Buddhism, the ego is not a self-existing consciousness but a fragile sense of self that suspects and dreads its own no-thing-ness. This third type of dukkha motivates our conditioned consciousness to try to ground itself—that is, I want to make myself real. Since the sense of self is a construct, however, it can real-ize itself (or rather, try to realize itself) only by objectifying itself (securing itself as an object) in the world. That makes the ego-self, in effect, a never ending project to objectify itself in some way—something that, unfortunately, our conditioned, ever changing consciousness cannot do, anymore than a hand can grasp itself or an eye see itself. The consequence of this perpetual failure is that the sense of self is shadowed by a sense of lack. What Freud called “the return of the repressed” in the distorted form of a symptom links this basic yet hopeless project with the symbolic ways we try to make ourselves feel real in the world. We experience this deep sense of lack as the feeling that “there is something wrong with me,” yet that feeling manifests, and we respond to it, in many different ways: I’m not rich enough, not loved enough, not powerful enough, not published enough (for academics!), and so forth. Our root anxiety is eager to objectify into fear of something, because then we have particular ways to cope with particular feared things. The difficulty, however, is that no objectiﬁcation can ever satisfy us if it is not really an object we want. In this way Buddhism shifts our focus from the terror of death (our primal repression, according to Becker) to the anguish of a groundlessness experienced here and now. The problem is not so much that we will die, but that we do not feel real now. If so, what does this third type of dukkha imply socially? Is there a communal version of sankhara-dukkhata? In Escape from Evil Becker argues that society is a collective immortality project. Can it also be understood as a collective reality project, a group effort to ground ourselves? That issue, among others, is addressed in chapter 8. An affirmative answer casts a somewhat different light on the loss of our sacred canopies. If religious worldviews provide us with transcendentally validated projects that promise to make us real (i.e., various types of supernatural salvation), the decline of faith in such collective canopies can only lead to more frantic and desperate attempts to real-ize ourselves.

#### The goal of spreading American ideals is an egoistic drive to pursue US interests in the name of values

Loy, 9

(David Robert Loy is a professor, writer, and Zen teacher in the Sanbo Kyodan tradition of Japanese Zen Buddhism. “Awareness Bound and Unbound” pg. 151-152) Henge

We have supported constitutionalism, human rights, liberty, the rule of law, and democracy in other countries when those values have produced leaders amenable to our own national interests. Those same values evidently resonate less loudly for us when they produce leaders who have different ideas, such as Chávez in Venezuela. In 1954, for example, the United States sponsored a coup against the democratically elected government of Guatemala, which over the following years led to the deaths of over one hundred thousand peasants. In 1965 the United States overthrew the government of the Dominican Republic and helped to kill some three thousand people in the process. In 1973, the United States sponsored a coup against the democratically elected government of Chile that murdered or “disappeared” several thousand people. In the 1980s the United States sponsored a terrorist war by the contras against the government of Nicaragua, which led to the deaths of over thirty thousand innocent people and to a World Court declaration that the U.S. government was a war criminal for mining Nicaragua’s harbors. Another U.S.-supported war in the 1980s, against El Salvador, resulted in the deaths of eighty thousand more innocent people. Lots of “collateral damage.” All those recent examples are from Latin America alone. In 1965 the United States also sponsored or assisted a military coup in Indonesia that led to the deaths of over half a million people, and the military dictatorship of Suharto, who invited Western corporations back into the country. When President Bush declares that Iran is part of a new “axis of evil,” we should remember why many Iranians return the compliment, viewing the U.S. government as “the Great Satan.” When Western oil interests in that country were challenged by a democratically elected prime minister in the early 1950s, the CIA helped to sponsor a brutal coup that installed the widely detested shah of Iran, whose notorious Savak secret service then proceeded to torture and kill over seventy thousand Iranians between 1952 and 1979. There are many more examples, unfortunately, yet the point is made. Clearly the problem here is something more than not quite living up to our own ideals. It is not that we just keep making mistakes, such as innocently backing the wrong sort of people. Once can be a mistake, twice may be stupidity, but this pattern of repeated violations of our own self-declared values amounts to something more sinister. “By their fruits shall you know them,” as someone once put it. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that our so-called values are not really our values, at least not when it comes to international relations. The basic problem is not a clash between our values and theirs, but between our (declared) values and our (short-term) interests.

#### The aff’s appeal to truth is flawed—all knowledge is constructed by our own views about the world—the circulation of the symbolic denies stable meaning

Loy, 3

(David Robert Loy is a professor, writer, and Zen teacher in the Sanbo Kyodan tradition of Japanese Zen Buddhism. “The Great Awakening” pg. 9-10) Henge

The last few centuries have been a steep downhill slide for human hubris. Copernicus discovered that our planet is not the center of the universe. Darwin realized that Homo sapiens can be understood as a result of the same evolutionary process that continues to produce other species, a natural selection that does not require any creator God. And, although Freud’s legacy is more controversial, his theory of repression implies that we are not even the masters of our own minds: our supposedly self-suﬃcient ego-consciousness is not autonomous but irremediably split, buffeted by psychic forces that it cannot control because our consciousness itself is a function of them. And that was only the beginning. More recently, poststructuralist critiques by Jacques Derrida and others have demonstrated the constructed nature of the subject by emphasizing the differences inherent in language. Our conciousness, like our texts, can never attain a stable self-presence because the continual circulation of signiﬁers denies meaning any ﬁxed foundation. Michel Foucault has argued quite convincingly that reason itself is mortal: each new epoch ﬁnds that the basic framework of its predecessor has become unintelligible; and, furthermore, what we have understood to be knowledge cannot be understood apart from its role in systems of human control. Some of the postmodern claims remain controversial, but many of them are consistent with developments in other disciplines such as psychology, anthropology, and comparative religion. The discovery that the world contains multiple worldviews, that each of those views has its own logic, and that there is no “master” worldview that subsumes all the others, has led to the realization that knowledge about the world—including our own knowledge about our own individual worlds—is not discovered but constructed. This shifts the focus to the truth about truth. Why do we construct the world in the ways that we do? As we become more aware of the factors that inﬂuence our constructions, what other constructs become possible?

### AT—Do Both

#### The links are obviously DAs to the permutation

#### No risk of a net benefit—the alternative solves the root cause of violent action

#### The desire for attachment coopts the permutation—only the genuine awakening of the alternative can solve

Loy, 9

(David Robert Loy is a professor, writer, and Zen teacher in the Sanbo Kyodan tradition of Japanese Zen Buddhism. “Awareness Bound and Unbound” pg. 22-23) Henge

Nevertheless, after awakening one’s mental predispositions (samskaras) do not necessarily or immediately lose their attraction. A liberated smoker will not automatically lose the physical desire for a cigarette. A genuine awakening should make it much easier, of course, to ignore that urge, but the desire will arise. This point reflects on long-standing debates about whether enlightenment is instantaneous or gradual, all-or-nothing or in stages. Realizing the unbounded nature of one’s attention may or may not be dramatic, but it happens suddenly. It is not something that I do, nor does it happen to me, for both of those ways of understanding are dualistic; rather, there is a letting go. Of what? Not simply of whatever I am grasping, but of grasping. Yet habitual tendencies do not simply evaporate. One’s attention still tends to assume familiar forms, and this highlights the importance of continued practice: the more gradual process of making intrinsically free awareness more effectively free. This also touches on the problem with comprehending Buddhism philosophically, or taking it as a philosophy. I can understand (and write about?) all of this conceptually, without it making much difference in my daily life, in how my attention actually functions. Grasping the implications of these concepts is very different from letting go of grasping. So far, I have made no reference to any “object of consciousness,” preferring the notion of “attention or awareness taking form.” Especially in a Mahayana context, any mention of form evokes the central claim of the Heart Sutra that “form (rupa) is no other than emptiness (shunyata), emptiness no other than form.” So far, too, this chapter has not mentioned shunyata, largely because of the baggage that accompanies that overused term. For Madhyamaka shunyata, “the absence of self-existence,” is a shorthand way of referring to the interconditionality of all phenomena, the fact that every phenomenon arises in dependence on others. In terms of my basic claim— delusion as attention bound, awakening as attention unbound—the Heart Sutra’s famous equation gains a somewhat different significance. Awareness unbound is shunya, having no form or any other qualities of its own. More precisely, awareness whether bound or unbound is shunya, although bound awareness is unaware of its intrinsic nature because it is too busy grasping and too afraid to let go. Attention in itself can be characterized only by its characteristiclessness: being formless and colorless, “it” is nothing, which is why it can become any-thing, according to circumstances. Emptiness is not other than form, because nothing-in-itself attention is always assuming one or another form—not only visual and tactile ones, but sounds, tastes, smells, thoughts, and so on. Then perhaps the many statements in the Heart Sutra that “X (the five skandhas, the twelve nidanas, etc.) is shunya” are not making (or denying) an ontological claim about the nature of X-in-itself, but rather pointing out the nature of the relationship between empty-in-itself awareness and the various forms it assumes.10

#### The permutation traps us by attaching us to the affirmative—only the alternative can create a formless mind

Loy, 9

(David Robert Loy is a professor, writer, and Zen teacher in the Sanbo Kyodan tradition of Japanese Zen Buddhism. “Awareness Bound and Unbound” pg. 13-15) Henge

Do we miss the nature of liberated mind, not because it is too obscure or profound to understand, but because it is too obvious? Perhaps, like Edgar Allen Poe’s purloined letter, we keep overlooking it: rummaging around hither and thither, we cannot find what we are searching for because it is in plain sight. Or, to employ a better metaphor, we look for the spectacles that rest unnoticed on our nose. Unable to see her reflection in the well, Enyadatta wanders about looking for her head. Mind seeks for mind. Such, at least, has been a central claim of the Mahayana tradition. How central? How much insight might be gained by taking seriously and literally the many Buddhist admonitions about “not settling down in things” and the importance of wandering freely “without a place to rest.” Although a few qualifications will need to be made later, my basic thesis is simple: Delusion (ignorance, samsara): attention/awareness is fixated (attached to forms) Liberation (enlightenment, nirvana): attention/awareness is liberated from grasping Although the true nature of awareness is formless, it becomes “trapped” when we identify with particular things, which include mental objects (e.g., ideologies, one’s self-image) as well as physical ones. Such identifications happen due to ignorance of the basic “nondwelling” nature of our awareness. The familiar words “attention” and “awareness” are used to emphasize that the distinction being drawn refers not to some abstract metaphysical entity (“Mind” or “Consciousness”) but simply to how our everyday awareness functions.1 To appropriate Hakuin’s metaphor in Zazen Wasan, the difference between Buddhas and other beings is that between water and ice: without water there is no ice, without Buddha no sentient beings—which suggests that deluded beings might simply be “frozen” Buddhas. I hope to show that this straightforward distinction is not only consistent with basic Buddhist teachings but also gives us insight into some of the more difficult ones. Moreover, this perspective may illuminate some aspects of our contemporary life-world, especially the particular challenges of modern technology and economics. Before developing the above claim about awareness, bound and unbound, it is necessary to emphasize how widespread and important it is within the Mahayana tradition, for it is found in many other canonical and commentarial texts besides the Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines. Thus, the most-quoted line from a better-known Prajnaparamita text, the Diamond Sutra, encapsulates the central doctrine of the Ashtasahasrika Sutra in one phrase: “Let your mind come forth without fixing it anywhere.” According to the Platform Sutra of the sixth Ch’an patriarch Hui-neng, this verse precipitated his great awakening, and certainly his teachings make and remake the same point: “When our mind works freely without any hindrance, and is at liberty to ‘come’ or to ‘go,’ we attain liberation.” Such a mind “is everywhere present, yet it ‘sticks’ nowhere.” Hui-neng emphasized that he had no system of Dharma to transmit: “What I do to my disciples is to liberate them from their own bondage with such devices as the case may need” (Yampolsky 133).2 Po-chang Hui-hai, another Chan master who lived about a century later, elaborated on the nature of liberated mind: Should your mind wander away, do not follow it, whereupon your wandering mind will stop wandering of its own accord. Should your mind desire to linger somewhere, do not follow it and do not dwell there, whereupon your mind’s questing for a dwelling place will cease of its own accord. Thereby, you will come to possess a non-dwelling mind—a mind that remains in the state of non-dwelling. If you are fully aware in yourself of a non-dwelling mind, you will discover that there is just the fact of dwelling, with nothing to dwell upon or not to dwell upon. This full awareness in yourself of a mind dwelling upon nothing is known as having a clear perception of your own mind, or, in other words, as having a clear perception of your own nature. A mind which dwells upon nothing is the Buddha-mind, the mind of one already delivered, Bodhi-Mind, Un-created Mind . . . (Huihai, in Blofeld 1969, 56)

#### The struggle demands individual peace as the process of change—no violent revolution is possible, merely a spiritual transformation

Loy, 3

(David Robert Loy is a professor, writer, and Zen teacher in the Sanbo Kyodan tradition of Japanese Zen Buddhism. “The Great Awakening” pg. 35-36) Henge

From a Buddhist perspective, there is nothing surprising about that. If I do not struggle with the greed in my own heart, it is quite likely that, once in power, I too will be inclined to take advantage of the situation to serve my own interests. If I do not acknowledge the ill will in my own heart, I am more than likely to project it onto those who obstruct me. If I remain unaware that my sense of duality is a dangerous delusion, I will understand the problem of social change as the need for me to dominate the sociopolitical order. Add a conviction of my good intentions, along with a conviction of my superior understanding of the situation, and one has a recipe for disaster. This suggests a social principle—the commitment to nonviolence—that for Buddhism is vital, for several reasons. Emphasis on transience implies another nonduality, that between means and ends. Peace is not only the goal, it must also be the way; or as Thich Nhat Hanh and Mahaghosananda have put it, peace is every step. We ourselves must be the peace we want to create. A model here is Gandhi, who with some justice may be considered a twentieth-century Buddha. There is another good reason to be nonviolent: it is more likely to be effective. The people who administer our economic and political institutions, and who also happen to beneﬁt (in the narrow sense) the most from those arrangements, control an awesomely destructive military power and the instruments of police surveillance. Fantasies of a violent revolution that would replace them with a just social order need to be replaced with the revolutionary realization that the struggle for social change is primarily a spiritual one, a clash of worldviews and moral visions. It is important to avoid the violent backlash that violence invites and, even more imperative to preclude the “moral backlash” that occurs when the focus of a challenge shifts from an untenable worldview to the violence used to challenge it. In the late 1960s and early 1970s the violent posturing of radical groups such as the Weathermen and the Black Panthers was suicidal. We should not have any illusions that nonviolence will make this struggle easy. Our leaders—who might more accurately be called our “rulers”—also have powerful media and persuasive public relations machines to inculcate their worldview. How quickly the presidential coup d’etat in the 2000 U.S. elections was forgotten in the aftermath of September 11! How quickly, again, corporate scandals such as Enron and WorldCom, which threatened to implicate the White House, were forgotten as the focus shifted to invading Saddam’s Iraq!

### 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.

### 2NC—Ethics

#### Only the alternative can create compassionate relations with others—requires a recognition of social identity and broad context of morality

Garfield, ND

(Jay Garfield, Smith College, the University of Melbourne, and the Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies. “Buddhist Ethics” <http://www.academia.edu/2833485/Buddhist_Ethics>) Henge

Compassion in this tradition is founded upon the insight that suffering is bad, per se, regardless of whose it is. To fail to take another’s suffering seriously as a motivation for action is itself a form of suffering and is irrational. This is a deep insight, and one over which we should not pass too quickly: the bodhisattva path is motivated in part by the realization that not to experience the suffering of others as one’s own and not to take the welfare of others as one’s own is to suffer even more deeply from a profound existential alienation born of a failure to appreciate one’s own situation as a member of an interdependent community. Our joys are social joys; our sorrows are social sorrows; our identity is a social identity; the bounds of our society are indefinite. We either suffer and rejoice together in the recognition of our bonds to one another, or we languish in self-imposed solitary confinement, afflicted both by the cell we construct, and by the ignorance that motivates its construction. Compassion, grounded in the awareness of our joint participation in global life, hence is the wellspring of the motivation for the development of all perfections, and the most reliable motivation for morally decent actions. Compassion is also, on this view, the direct result of a genuine appreciation of the emptiness and interdependence of all sentient beings. Once on sees oneself as nonsubstantial and existing only in interdependence, and once one sees that the happiness and suffering of all sentient beings is entirely causally conditioned, the only rational attitude one can adopt to others is a compassionate one. Compassion requires one to develop upåya, or skillful means, in order to realize one’s objectives. Compassionate intention is only genuine if it involves a commitment to action and to the successful completion of action, enabled by the skills requisite for that action. A desire to eradicate world hunger is not genuinely compassionate in this sense if it leads nowhere. But moving to eradicate world hunger requires that one know how to act, if only to know to which organizations to donate, let alone to help others to grow or distribute food. It is in the domain of upåya that Buddhist and Western ethics converge in practice and it is in this domain that each can learn from the other. Often the best way to ensure that minimal human needs are met, for instance, is to establish rights to basic goods, and to enshrine those rights in collective moral and political practice. Often the best way to ensure that human dignity is respected is to enshrine values that treat persons as individual bearers of value. Often the best way to ensure plenty is to develop social welfare policies. And often the best way to develop flourishing citizens is to articulate a theory of virtue. Western moral theorists have been good at this. Liberal democratic theory and a framework of human rights has been a very effective device for the reduction of suffering, though hardly perfect or unproblematic. So has utilitarian social welfare theory. And virtue theories have been useful in moral education. These Western articulations of the right, the good and the decent provide a great deal of specific help in the pursuit of the bodhisattva path. On the other hand, Buddhist moral theory provides a larger context in which to set these moral programs, and one perhaps more consonant with a plausible metaphysics of personhood and action, and with the genuine complexity of our moral lives. To the extent that that world is characterized by omnipresent suffering, and to the extent that that is a real problem, perhaps the fundamental problem for a morally concerned being, Buddhist moral theory may provide the best way to conceptualize that problem in toto. But Buddhist moral theory and Western moral theory can meet profitably when we ask how to solve that problem in concrete human circumstances, and it is in these concrete human circumstances that we must solve it