# 2nc – Impact Extension/A2: Util

**We have two impacts, the first is epistemology** – our alternative mignolo evidence indicates that the form of thinking representative in the aff has an emancipatory potential that is overshadowed by an ethnocidal bias against non-Western culture. It is a form of thinking that in the quest for supremacy creates universal categories to civilize the rest of the world or destroy it.

**The second impact is life** - Extend the Mignolo impact evidence - it indicates that the bodies of non-Europeans do not enter into utilitarian calculus. Their deaths are seen as inevitable and necessary in the path to progress. They become uncalculable life subject to indiscriminate violence. The political logic employed by cost benefit utilitarianism is a form of ethical decision-making that strips life of any value. This produces a calculus that routinizes the killing of others where any atrocity is forgotten and just.

**SPANOS 2000** [William V, anatomy of an empire,P 272]

20. Michael Herr, *Dispatches* (New York: Vintage, 1991), 71. **The** **terrible** **banality of the American colonel's response** should not be understood as either unique or confined to the American military leaders. On the contrary, it **reflects the thinking of the American cultural army that planned the** **Vietnam War** that the military executed **by way of the indiscriminate strategy of the body count.** As Richard Ohmann's brilliant analysis of the appallingly banal inhumanity of the language of *The Pentagon Papers* demonstrated a quarter of a century ago - only to be forgotten - **the policy makers in the Pentagon relied on an unrelenting "problem-solving" rationality**: the fulfilled allotrope of the American pragmatist tradition. **They based their futural projections on a pre- preestablished but unacknowledged narrative scenario that was informed by a purely quantitative measure absolutely stripped of any consciousness of** particularity, especially **human particularity**. It is a mistake to read the dehumanizing logic of these memoranda as simply a *conscious* strategy, cynical or otherwise, intended to render the conduct of the war more efficient by obliterating from view the particularities of that occasion that would complicate and impede the progress of the war. On the contrary, the logic of these Pentagon thinkers - they were "the best and the brightest" - was the logic of common sense taken to its end. **Those who practiced it were not unique conspirators, evil men in the conventional sense of the word; they were Americans whose thought was consonant with the truth as most Americans understood it. That is the real horror of these inhuman documents that routinize killing: they show no evidence of their authors' consciousness of the reality they were indiscriminately obliterating**. As Ohmann says, "The main point to make [in the context of **the terrible effects of this "cost/benefit" rhetorical framework of this problem-solving thinking] is that since the suffering of the Vietnamese didn't impinge on the consciousness of the policy-makers, it had virtually no existence for them**" (Ohmann, *English in America,* 202).

# 2nc – perm block

**All of our links are disads to the permutation that prove the epistemology of the affirmative is tainted – this alternative doesn’t function by overcoming the status quo but by refusing the universalism of the western narrative, utilization of their epistemology serves to continue the status quo.**

**And, your permutation is merely the same attempt to continue the western frame of thinking. The attempt at making minor epistemic adjustments via reforms is not enough. We need a radical epistemological re-evaluation.**

**Deloria 1999** [Vine, For this land p 101]

But this replacement only begins the task ofliberation. For the history ofWestern thinking in the past eight centuries has been one of replacement of ideas within a framework that has remained basically unchanged for nearly two millenia. Challenging this framework of interpretation means a rearrangement of our manner of perceiving the world, and it involves a reexamination of the body ofhuman knowledge and its structural reconstruction into a new format. Such a task appears to be far from the struggles of the present. It seems abstract and meaningless in the face of contemporary suffering. And it suggests that people can be made to change their oppressive activity by intellectual reorientation alone. All these questions arise, however, because of the fundamental orientation of Western peoples toward the world. We assume that we know the structure of reality and must only make certain minor adjustments in the machinery that operates it in order to bring our institutions into line. Immediate suffering is thus placed in juxtaposition with abstract metaphYSical conceptions of the world and, because we can see immediate Suffering, we feel impelled to change conditions quickly to relieve tenSions, never coming to understand how the basic attitude toward life and its derivative attitudes toward minority groups continues to dominate the goals and activities that appear designed to create reforms.

**Further, the alternative is a sequencing question – before we can effectively engage we have to have the questioning of the epistemology of the aff. Two pieces of mignolo evidence prove the need to remove the base epistemic foundation of the plan.**

**Prefer the alternative over the permutation – their permutation serves the interest of expediency. we are the only ones with comparative evidence about questioning and political expediency in the context of western epistemology**

**Smith 2005** [Andrea, Conquest: sexual violence and American Indian Genocide p 185-186]

Unfortunately, while Habermas argues that the public sphere is fundamentally based on exclusion, he contradicts himself by continuing to hold it up as a model for addressing conflict within society In fact, it is a Consistent practice among progressives to bemoan the genocide of Native peoples, but in the interest of political expediency, implicitly sanction it by refusing to question the legitimacy of the settler nation responsible for this genocide, it is incumbent upon all people who benefit from living on native lands to consider how they can engage in social justice struggles without constantly selling out native peoples in the interest of political expediency in the short term. I say “short term” because it is fundamentally nonsensical to expect that we can fundamentally challenge white supremacy, imperialism, and economic exploitation within the structures of U.S. colonialism and empire in the long term. In questioning the legitimacy of the U.S., it necessarily follows that we question the nation-state as an appropriate form of governance. Doing so allows us to free our political imagination to begin thinking of how we can begin to build a world we would actually want to live in. such a political project is particularly important for colonized peoples seeking national liberation because it allows us to differentiate “nation” from “nation state.” Helpful in this project of imagination is the work of native women activists who have begun articulating notions of “nation” and “sovereignty” which are governed trhough domination and coercion, indigenous sovereignty and nationhood is predicated on interrelatedness and responsibility.

# 2NC Round 6 Links

**1 – Salvation – the 1ac positions itself as a savior with a solution to the totalitarian despotism of the status quo. This shields the affirmative from criticism because they deceive you into believe they are acting on behalf of a population. This is the position of western coloniality and how it views the world as an object to be controlled or even saved. This also relies on a universal notion of humanity that enables a civilizing standard to be applied and for some to be deprived human status.**

**2 – Law – Our Mignolo evidence says that they have chosen the wrong locus of change – colonialism has to be altered at an epistemic level however the plan creates this by altering the public’s mind through the law. This fails to create effective dialogue leaving colonialism in tact.**

3 – Our Lewis evidence indicates empirically nuclear power has worked to destroy indigenous culture, through production and dumping of nuclear energy, look even if they make the argument SMRs reprocess their stuff it doesn’t mean they solve the nuclear waste

Nuclear power is not benign – it has devastating effects on the environment and is part and parcel of the continuation of environmental racism.

Energy Justice Network 8 [December 16, Energy Justice is the [grassroots energy agenda](http://www.energyjustice.net/platform/), supporting communities threatened by polluting energy and waste technologies. Taking direction from our grassroots base and the [Principles of Environmental Justice](http://ejnet.org/ej/principles.pdf), we advocate a clean energy, zero-emission, zero-waste future for all, http://www.energyjustice.net/nuclear]

Nuclear power is an expensive, polluting, dangerous, racist, depletable, and now foreign source of energy. 80-90% of uranium used in the U.S. is imported from Canada, Australia, the former Soviet Union and Africa.[1](http://www.energyjustice.net/nuclear/#1) At the current consumption rate, low-cost uranium reserves will be exhausted in about 50 years.[2](http://www.energyjustice.net/nuclear/#2) **Uranium Mining** The nuclear chain begins with uranium mining, a polluting activity that devastates large areas. Uranium ore can contains as little as 500 grams recoverable uranium per million grams of earth. [3](http://www.energyjustice.net/nuclear/#3) Enormous amounts of rock have to be dug up, crushed and chemically processed to extract the uranium. The remaining wastes, still containing large amounts of radioactivity, remain at the mines. These "tailings" are often stored in a very poor condition, resulting in the contamination of surface- and groundwater. Natural uranium contains two different forms, or isotopes: U-238 and U-235. U-235 is fissionable, which means its atoms can be split, releasing large amounts of heat. However, natural uranium consists of more than 99% U-238 and less than 1% U-235. To be used as a fuel, large amounts of U-238 must be removed to increase the proportion of U-235 to 3-5%.[4](http://www.energyjustice.net/nuclear/#4) **Nuclear Weapons** Depleted uranium (DU) is the U-238 waste product that has been “depleted” of U-235. DU has been used to make armor piercing bullets, tank shielding and more. When used in warfare, DU bursts into flames upon impact, spreading uranium dust into the environment. DU is radioactive for billions of years and hundreds of tons of it have contaminated Iraq, Afghanistan, Bosnia and testing locations like Vieques, Puerto Rico. It’s the primary culprit in Gulf War Syndrome and many other health problems.[5](http://www.energyjustice.net/nuclear/#5) The same process used to make reactor fuel can be used to highly enrich uranium for nuclear bombs. This is why nuclear power programs have led to nuclear weapons programs in other countries. **Pollution in the Nuclear Fuel Cycle** Many steps are required to make uranium suitable for use in nuclear reactors. From mining to milling to conversion to enrichment to fuel fabrication, each step involves separate facilities throughout the U.S. poisoning communities with radioactive and chemical pollution (mostly in western and mid-western states). **Global warming** While the nuclear reactors themselves release few greenhouse gases, the nuclear fuel cycle is a significant contributor. In 2001, 93% of the nation’s reported emissions of CFC-114,[6](http://www.energyjustice.net/nuclear/#6) a potent greenhouse gas, were released from the U.S. Enrichment Corporation, where uranium is enriched to make nuclear reactor fuel. These facilities are so energy intensive that some of the nation’s dirty, old coal plants exist just to power the nuclear fuel facilities.[7](http://www.energyjustice.net/nuclear/#7) Nuclear reactors themselves have serious environmental and public health impacts. Radioactive air and water pollution is released through the routine operation of all nuclear reactors. A wide range of radioactive isotopes are released with varying radioactive and chemical properties – some toxic, some not, some more radioactive than others, some lasting minutes, some lasting billions of years.[8](http://www.energyjustice.net/nuclear/#8) Living near a nuclear facility increases your chances of dying from breast cancer. A nationwide survey of 268 counties within 50 miles of 51 nuclear reactors, found breast cancer deaths in these "nuclear counties" to be 10 times the national rate from 1950 to 1989.[9](http://www.energyjustice.net/nuclear/#9) In the 7 years after the closure of 8 nuclear reactors, infant mortality rates (deaths to infants under 1 year of age) fell dramatically in downwind communities.[10](http://www.energyjustice.net/nuclear/#10) Strontium-90, a radioactive pollutant now released only from nuclear reactors, ends up in milk and bones, contributing to bone cancer and leukemia. Studies of Sr-90 in baby teeth found levels 30-50% higher in teeth of children living near reactors.[11](http://www.energyjustice.net/nuclear/#11) Background levels are rising with continued use of nuclear reactors, rising to levels comparable to when atmospheric nuclear bomb tests contaminated the nation in the 1940s and ‘50s. Levels in the teeth of babies born in the late 1990s are about 50% higher than those born in the late 1980s. Of the 7 areas examined so far in the baby tooth studies, the highest Sr-90 levels have been found in southeastern PA – around the Limerick reactor. Living near reactors is also correlated with increases in leukemia and childhood cancer. **Water Use: Harming Wildlife** Reactors require huge amounts of cooling water, which is why they’re often located near rivers, lakes or oceans. Reactors with cooling towers or ponds can use 28-30 million gallons of water per day.[12](http://www.energyjustice.net/nuclear/#12) The 48 reactors with once-through cooling systems use far more (up to 1.5 billion gallons per day). A typical two-unit reactor using once-through cooling takes in about a square mile of water, 14 feet deep, each day. The initial devastation of marine life and ecosystems stems from the powerful intake of water into the nuclear reactor. Marine life, ranging from endangered sea turtles and manatees down to delicate fish larvae and microscopic planktonic organisms vital to the ocean ecosystem, is sucked irresistibly into the reactor cooling system. Some of these animals are killed when trapped against filters, grates, and other structures, or, in the case of air-breathing animals like turtles, seals, and manatees, they drown or suffocate.[13](http://www.energyjustice.net/nuclear/#13) An equally huge volume of wastewater is discharged at temperatures up to 25 o F hotter than the water into which it flows. Indigenous marine life suited to colder temperatures is eliminated or forced to move, disrupting delicately balanced ecosystems. **Waste** Radioactive wastes are produced continually in reactors. There are two basic types of nuclear waste: high-level nuclear waste (the used fuel rods) and “low-level radioactive waste” (everything else). High-level nuclear waste (also called irradiated or “spent” fuel) is literally about one million times more radioactive than when the fuel rods were loaded into the reactor. This waste is so lethal that standing near it without shielding would kill you within minutes. This waste will be hazardous for millions of years. No technology exists to keep it isolated this long. Irradiated fuel rods are stored in storage pools inside reactor buildings, often several stories high, where they’re highly vulnerable to aircraft attacks.[14](http://www.energyjustice.net/nuclear/#14) If the water is drained from the pool, exposing the rods to open air, a meltdown would cause a massive release of radiation. Some utilities have begun storing this waste in dry casks on outdoor concrete pads in the backyard of the reactors, introducing separate storage, packaging and security problems. A permanent “disposal” site planned for Yucca Mountain, Nevada has many problems. It’s far from where most waste is produced, requiring unprecedented numbers of shipments through 43 states, risking accidents and attacks. Yucca Mountain is on Native American lands and is too leaky to keep the waste dry.[15](http://www.energyjustice.net/nuclear/#15) The site is amid active fault lines and is too small to store the amount of waste that would be generated by the time it opens (if it ever does). Currently, a site on Native lands in Utah is proposed to store the waste “temporarily.” “Low-level” radioactive waste (LLRW) is defined as all other radioactive waste from reactors, regardless of radioactivity levels or health hazards. Large amounts of this waste have been dumped or burned. Six official LLRW dumps exist in the U.S. All are leaking, contaminating groundwater.[16](http://www.energyjustice.net/nuclear/#16) **Environmental Racism** Nuclear power disproportionately affects communities of color, from the mining of uranium on Native American and Aboriginal lands, to the targeting of black and Hispanic communities for new uranium processing facilities to the targeting of black and Hispanic and Native American communities for “low-level” nuclear waste dumps. All sites proposed for “temporary” and permanent storage of high level nuclear waste have been Native American lands.[17](http://www.energyjustice.net/nuclear/#17) **Too Expensive** Nuclear power is the most expensive form of power and could not exist with massive subsidies, including the “Price-Anderson” law that places a cap on industry liability in the event of a nuclear accident. **Fusion** Fusion still produces nuclear waste, including tritium, a very dangerous, hard-to-contain air and water contaminant.[18](http://www.energyjustice.net/nuclear/#18) Like fission, it would be very expensive and highly centralized. Despite massive research spending, it’s still decades away from reality. The same money spent on clean solutions (conservation, efficiency, wind and solar) would do far more.

**Kagan’s desire for hegemony leads to preemptive warfare and global instability**

**Langø 1-28**— Research assistant at NUPI, Master of Arts in International Relations, Boston University

Hans-Inge, “With Great Power Comes Great Temptation: Or How Not to Turn the Dial to 11”, <http://hegemonicobsessions.com/?p=716>, CMR

A quick aside here, Kagan never actually articulates what he wants the United States to do with our ‘newfound’ power, except stressing that “[p]reserving the present world order requires constant American leadership and constant American commitment.” I call this code for familiar neoconservative notions of preventive war, militarization of foreign policy, and blunt force trauma, but if someone has a better interpretation I’ll amend my statement.

It may be redundant so say this, but having power does not necessitate an obligation for using it, let alone using it the way neoconservatives would. There are smarter ways of maintaining global dominance than turning the military dial up to 11. As Andrew Exum tweeted the other day, “I thought Bob Kagan’s article was pretty neat as well. Yet I still think invading Iraq was seven shades of dumb.” But there is another issue beyond what is the most effective way of reaching your goals. The United States is an independent variable in international relations, able to create new threats and conflicts on its own. Its posture provokes uncertainty amongst certain states, while its military operations, both small and large, can have debilitating effects on regional stability. We still do not know the long-term implications of U.S. Afghanistan policy on South Asian security, but we have already seen how short-term policies have created unnecessary security problems in the region, The United States inadvertently caused a Taliban resurgence in Afghanistan, while also strengthening the military’s dominance in Pakistan through aid and cooperation, to the detriment of Pakistani society. Avoiding such errors of excess by confusing ability with policy would be the most prudent rule of thumb, decline or no decline.

**The focus on avoiding nuclear war is a discursive strategy that privileges the first world community over local populations and different cultures. This has uniquely created justifications for the obliteration of cultural diversity in order to preserve western society**

**KATO 1993** [MASAHIDE Dept. of Political Science at the University of Hawaii, “Nuclear Globalism: Traversing Rockets, Satellites, and Nuclear war via the Strategic Gaze,” *Alternatives* 18, 1993, pp. 339-360]

The vigorous invasion of the logic of capitalist accumulation into the last vestige of relatively autonomous space in the periphery under late capitalism is propelled not only by the desire for incorporating every fabric of the society into the division of labor but also by the desire for "pure" destruction/extermination of the periphery." The penetration of capital into the social fabric and the destruction of nature and preexisting social organizations by capital are not separable. However, what we have witnessed in the phase of late capitalism is a rapid intensification of the destruction and extermination of the periphery. In this context, capital is no longer interested in incorporating some parts of the periphery into the international division of labor. The emergence of such "pure" destruction/extermination of the periphery can be explained, at least partially, by another problematic of late capitalism formulated by Ernest Mandel: the mass production of the means of destruction." Particularly, the latest phase of capitalism distinguishes itself from the earlier phases in its production of the "ultimate" means of destruction/extermination, i.e., nuclear weapons. Let us recall our earlier discussion about the critical historicalconjuncture where the notion of "strategy" changed its nature and became deregulated/dispersed beyond the boundaries set by the interimperial rivalry. Herein, the perception of the ultimate means of destruction can be historically contextualized. The only instances of real nuclear catastrophe perceived and thus given due recognition by the First World community are the explosions at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which occurred at this conjuncture. Beyond this historical threshold, whose meaning is relevant only to the interimperial rivalry, the nuclear catastrophe is confined to the realm of fantasy, for instance, apocalyptic imagery. And yet how can one deny the crude fact that nuclear war has been taking place on this earth in the name of "nuclear testing" since the first nuclear explosion at Alamogordo in 1945? As of 1991, 1,924 nuclear explosions have occurred on earth.28 The major perpetrators of nuclear warfare are the United States (936 times), the former Soviet Union (715 times), France (192 times), the United Kingdom (44 times), and China (36 times).29 The primary targets of warfare ("test site" to use Nuke Speak terminology) have been invariably the sovereign nations of Fourth World and Indigenous Peoples. Thus history has already witnessed the nuclear wars against the Marshall Islands (66 times), French Polynesia (175 times), Australian Aborigines (9 times), Newe Sogobia (the Western Shoshone Nation) (814 times), the Christmas Islands (24 times), Hawaii (Kalama Island, also known as Johnston Island) (12 times), the Republic of Kazakhstan (467 times), and Uighur (Xinjian Province, China) (36 times)." Moreover, although I focus primarily on "nuclear tests" in this article, if we are to expand the notion of nuclear warfare to include any kind of violence accrued from the nuclear fuel cycle (particularly uranium mining and disposition of nuclear wastes), we must enlist Japan and the European nations as perpetrators and add the Navaho, Havasupai and other Indigenous Nations to the list of targets. Viewed as a whole, nuclear war, albeit undeclared, has been waged against the Fourth World, and Indigenous Nations. The dismal consequences of "intensive exploitation," "low intensity intervention," or the "nullification of the sovereignty" in the Third World produced by the First World have taken a form of nuclear extermination in the Fourth World and Indigenous Nations. Thus, from the perspectives of the Fourth World and Indigenous Nations, the nuclear catastrophe has never been the "unthinkable" single catastrophe but the real catastrophe of repetitive and ongoing nuclear explosions and exposure to radioactivity. Nevertheless, ongoing nuclear wars have been subordinated to the imaginary grand catastrophe by rendering them as mere preludes to the apocalypse. As a consequence, the history and ongoing processes of nuclear explosions as war have been totally wiped out from the history and consciousness of the First World community. **Such a discursive strategy that aims to mask the "real" of nuclear warfare in the domain of imagery of nuclear catastrophe** can be observed even in Stewart Firth's *Nuclear Playground,* which extensively covers the history of "nuclear testing" in the Pacific: Nuclear explosions in the atmosphere ... were global in effect. The winds and seas carried radioactive contamination over vast areas of the fragile ecosphere on which we all depend for our survival and which we call the earth. In preparing for war, we were poisoning our planet and going into battle against nature itself." Although Firth's book is definitely a remarkable study of the history of "nuclear testing" in the Pacific, the problematic division/distinction between the "nuclear explosions" and the nuclear war is kept intact. The imagery of final nuclear war narrated with the problematic use of the subject ("we") is located higher than the "real" of nuclear warfare in terms of discursive value. This ideological division/hierarchization is the very vehicle through which the history and the ongoing processes of the destruction of the Fourth World and Indigenous Nations by means of nuclear violence are obliterated and hence legitimatized. The discursive containment/obliteration of the "real" of nuclear warfare has been accomplished, ironic as it may sound, by nuclear criticism. Nuclear criticism, with its firm commitment to global discourse, has established the unshakable authority of the imagery of nuclear catastrophe over the real nuclear catastrophe happening in the Fourth World and Indigenous Nations almost on a daily basis.

**And, your impacts are inevitable with the universalizing of modernity and its epistemic blindness**

Eckhardt 1990 (William, Lentz Peace Research Laboratory of St. Louis, JOURNAL OF PEACE RESEARCH, February 1990, p. 15-16)

Modern Western Civilization used war as well as peace to gain the whole world as a domain to benefit itself at the expense of others: The expansion of the culture and institutions of modern civilization from its centers in Europe was made possible by imperialistic war… It is true missionaries and traders had their share in the work of expanding world civilization, but always with the support, immediate or in the background, of armies and navies (pp. 251-252). The importance of dominance as a primary motive in civilized war in general was also emphasized for modern war in particular: '[Dominance] is probably the most important single element in the causation of major modern wars' (p. 85). European empires were thrown up all over the world in this processof benefiting some at the expense of others, which was characterized by armed violence contributing to structural violence: 'World-empire is built by conquest and maintained by force… Empires are primarily organizations of violence' (pp. 965, 969). 'The struggle for empire has greatly increased the disparity between states with respect to the political control of resources, since there can never be enough imperial territory to provide for all' (p. 1190). This 'disparity between states', not to mention the disparity within states, both of which take the form of racial differences in life expectancies, has killed 15-20 times as many people in the 20th century as have wars and revolutions (Eckhardt & Kohler, 1980; Eckhardt, 1983c). When this structural violence of 'disparity between states' created by civilization is taken into account, then the violent nature of civilization becomes much more apparent. Wright concluded that 'Probably at least 10 per cent of deaths in modern civilization can be attributed directly or indirectly to war… The trend of war has been toward greater cost, both absolutely and relative to population… The proportion of the population dying as a direct consequence of battle has tended to increase' (pp. 246, 247). So far as structural violence has constituted about one-third of all deaths in the 20th century (Eckhardt & Kohler, 1980; Eckhardt, 1983c), and so far as structural violence was a function of armed violence, past and present, then Wright's estimate was very conservative indeed. Assuming that war is some function of civilization, then civilization is responsible for one-third of 20th century deaths. This is surely self-destruction carried to a high level of efficiency. The structural situation has been improving throughout the 20th century, however, so that structural violence caused 'only' 20% of all deaths in 1980 (Eckhardt, 1983c). There is obviously room for more improvement. To be sure, armed violence in the form of revolution has been directed toward the reduction of structural violence, even as armed violence in the form of imperialism has been directed toward its maintenance. But imperial violence came first, in the sense of creating structural violence, before revolutionary violence emerged to reduce it. It is in this sense that structural violence was basically, fundamentally, and primarily a function of armed violence in its imperial form. The atomic age has ushered in the possibility, and some would say the probability, of killing not only some of us for the benefit of others, nor even of killing all of us to no one's benefit, but of putting an end to life itself! This is surely carrying self-destruction to some infinite power beyond all human comprehension. It's too much, or superfluous, as the Existentialists might say. Why we should care is a mystery. But, if we do, then the need for civilized peoples to respond to the ethical challenge is very urgent indeed. Life itself may depend upon our choice.

**Every epistemology indict we win is a reason they do not get their aff, because it is a reason the way they have produced knowledge and know the world is bad. Even if they win some small risk of their advantage it is not big enough of a risk to vote on, because our link arguments are based on the violence that comes from that construction of the world.**

# 2nc Alt extension

**Our alternative is critical border thinking – the distribution of accepted knowledge is heavily favored towards the west. Our alternative redistributes the geopolitics of knowledge by interrupting the naturalized assumption that the western enlightenment epistemology has the best access to credibility. Our criticism of modernity by showing its genocidal other-side enables us to celebrate the litany of ways of knowing that exist in the world. Do not take the ethnocentrism of the affirmative lightly – the possibility of ethnocide is stored in these universalizing extensions of knowledge. Our alternative refuses that logic.**

# 2nc a2: Heg good/Western imperialism good

**Group this debate – these claims have created a popular consciousness that routinizes mass violence in the name of survival. They portray enemies as subhuman and deserving of genocidal violence. It is critical that we reject this way of knowing.**

**BOGGS 2005** [Carl, Professor of Social Sciences at National University in Los Angeles, Adjunct Professor at Antioch University in Los Angeles, Imperial Delusions: American Militarism and Endless War, isbn: 0742527727, p \_\_187-188\_\_\_]

**One of the more tragic parts of the U.S. war crimes legacy has been its almost total absence from the public discourse: mass media, politics, academia, mtellectual life**. This can be understood as the result partly of civic ignorance, partly of collective denial, partly of what Gilbert Achcar refers to as "narcissistic compassion," indifference to the suffering of others. 64 However understood, **there is little question about the degree to which the horrible costs and consequences of American Empire have become largely routinized within both elite and popular consciousnes**s; the very idea of U.S. culpability for terrible atrocities, including war crimes, human rights violations, and crimes against humanity, is generally regarded as too far off the normal spectrum of discourse to be taken seriously. Given the postwar historical record, **we are dealing here with nothing less than large-scale insensitivity to mass murder. The United States has become such a dominant world superpower that its crimes are more or less invisible**, that is, they appear as an integral, acceptable, indeed predictable element of imperial power. Rarely a loser in war, **the United States has never had to confront the grievances of those who have been wronged.** This condition is exacerbated by the phenomenon of technowar, which, since World War **II,** has increasingly removed any sense of immediate *personal* involvement in warfare, meaning that **feelings of guilt, shame, and moral outrage that might be expected to accompany killing, and especially acts of mass murder, are more easily sidestepped, repressed, forgotten-more easily yet where such acts are carried out by proxies**. Long experience tells us that **ordinary people**, once having completed military training, **can all too often calmly plan and implement the killing of vast numbers of unknown, face-less, innocent, defenseless human beings**, whether by firing missiles, dropping bombs from thirty thousand feet, shooting off long-distance artillery shells, or engaging in traditional ground combat (increasingly rare for the U.S. military**). Once the enemy is portrayed as a sinister beast and monster, dehumanized as a worthless other, then the assault becomes a matter of organization, technique, and planning**, part of the day-to-day routi~e~ of s.imply obeying commands, carrying out assigned tasks, fitting all acnvities .Into a bureaucratic structure. **Within this universe the human targets of military action are regularly defined as barbaric, subhuman, deserving of their fate and possibly even complicit in it: Native Americans, Filipinos, Japanese, Guatemalan peasants, Koreans, Vietnamese, Iraqi,** erb. As on the frontier, **mass killing may be understood as necessary, a moral imperative to ensure human survival and save "civilization**." Viewed accordingly, **forces giving expression to racial supremacy, imperialism, and xenophobia converge with a cult of violence** (like that discussed in chapter 4) to form an ideological cauldron where crimes of war may come to seem natural, logical. Within the culture of militarism, large-scale massacres, authorized and legitimated by political and military commands, take on the character of the *ordinary,* where guilt and culpability are routinely evaded.P Actions viewed from outside this culture as heinous and criminal appear rather normal, acceptable, even praiseworthy *within* it, part of a taken-for-granted world. **Ethical discourses are roundly silenced, jettisoned.** Surveying U.S. war crimes, one can see that taken-for-granted barbari m takes many forms: the saturation bombing of civilian populations, free-fire zones, chemical warfare, relocations, search-and-destroy massacres, the torture and killing of prisoners-all sanctioned through an unwritten code of regular military operations. **In technowar especially, all human conduct becomes managerial, clinical, distant, impersonal, rendering the carnage technologically rational; individual emotional responses, including the pain and suffering of victims, disappear from view**. **Even the most ruthless, bloody actions have no villains, insofar as all initiative vanishes within the organizational apparatus and the culture supporting it. War managers' ideology contains specialized military/technical discourses with their own epistemology, basically devoid of moral criteria.** As Gibson writes in the context of Vietnam: "Technowar as a regime of mechanical power and knowledge posits the high-level command positions of the political and military bureaucracies as the legitimate sites of knowledge."66 Here bureaucratic jargon conveniently serves to obscure militarism and its victims with familiar references to the primacy of "national security," the need for "surgical strikes," the regrettable problem of "collateral damage," and "self-inflicted" casualties. **Words like "incursion" substitute for real armed attacks, "body counts" for mass slaughter, "civilian militias" for death squads. The very structure of language helps to establish a moral and political gulf between perpetrators and victims**, between war criminals and the crimes they commit. **In** general those who plan do not kill, and **those who kill are merely following orders-and they too are usually shielded from psychological immediacy by the mechanism of technowar**.

**Your defense of western science ignores the history of western violence and justifies war**

Alcoff 2007 [Linda Alcoff, Mingolo’s Epistemology of Coloniality, CR: The New Centennial Review, Volume 7, Number 3, Winter 2007, pp. 79-101 (Article)]

Hegemony in Mignolo’s usage of the term is very much taken from the Gramscian idea of hegemony as the construction of mass consent. That is, hegemony is achieved through a project of persuasion that works principally through claims to truth. Europe is ahead because Europe is smarter and more reflective than the rest of the world; the United States has the right to hog the world’s resources because it knows best how to make use of them. Leading liberals like Arthur Schlesinger make the claim for Western epistemic supremacy without any embarrassment: Schlesinger claims not that Europe (and the U.S. as a European nation) has made no mistakes, but that Europe alone invented the scientific method, which gave it the capacity to critique its mistakes. Moreover, he claims that, although every culture “has done terrible things,” “whatever the particular crimes of Europe, that continent is also the source—the unique source—of those liberating ideas . . . to which most of the world today aspires. These are European ideas, not Asian, nor African, nor Middle eastern ideas, except by adoption”(Schlesinger 1992, 127; emphasis in original). The result of the wide acceptance of such hegemonic claims in the United States and in Europe is a broad-based consent to imperial war as the presumptive entitlement of the political vanguard of the human race; the result of the acceptance of such hegemonic claims in the colonized world includes such symptomatic effects as the ones Samuel Ramos and Octavio Paz described when they said that Mexicans have an alienated relationship to their own temporal reality, and that they imagine the real present as occurring somewhere else than where they live. The temporal displacement or alienation of space, which causes the colonized person to be unable to experience their own time as the now and instead to see that “now” as occurring in another space, is the result of a Eurocentric organization of time in which time is measured by the developments in technological knowledge, the gadget porn of iPods and BlackBerrys, and the languages in which that technological knowledge is developed. Who is developing the latest gadgets? What language do they speak? These questions show us where the “now” resides, and thus, who is “behind.”

# Impact: Epistemic Violence

Colonialism’s violence is not just physical violence, but a genocide of both the body and the mind through the erasure of non-European cultures.

Mignolo and Tlostanova 9 [Walter D., Doctor of semiotics and literary theory, prof of decoloniality at Duke University, Madina, Doctor of literature and postcolonial studies, professor at People’s Friendship University of Russia, “Times for re-thinking, re-learning and networking, February, Interview, http://kristinabozic.wordpress.com/decolonization-interview/]

What if any is the difference between colonization and genocide?

Prof Mignolo: There is a difference, though I never really thought of it. The first thing that comes to mind is that genocide is a consequence of colonialism. Another question is can this be claimed for all genocides?

Prof Tlostanova: Holocaust, for example.

Prof Mignolo: Ooh. Let’s start the other way round. One of the features of coloniality is its connection to economy based on dispensability of human life, which is seen as a commodity: you sell sugar or you sell slaves. Genocide means we do not care. Therefore, genocide is possible because certain human lives are dispensable. Iraqi lives are more dispensable than American lives. Holocaust, however was based on stripping human life of legal rights, as Hannah Arendt writes. So it was not about the dispensability of human life in terms of economy but it presented bareness of life in relation to the state and law. For white European bourgeoisie Christians the really horrible part of holocaust was not the crime itself but the fact that it was committed against white people using the technique Europe learned in its colonies. Economic dispensability of human life that build the system of the economy liberals and Marxists call capitalism came back on the level of the state. Jews were internally inferior. I will not say that all genocides have been a consequence of coloniality, but I would make these two connections. The third one could be Rwanda. There colonialists, especially of the second wave after the Enlightenment created the idea of national identity. Before there existed communities of faith, not of birth. Genocide there was therefore a consequence of conditions colonialists left behind. We could think of other genocides … How can we think Stalin’s genocide?

Prof Tlostanova: I was just thinking about it. It was not framed in racial terms, though many scholars today question this. They ask if Stalin’s genocides were connected with people’s ethnic origins and race or only with class. There was no racial discourse in Soviet Union but crimes were often committed on racial grounds – nobody has ever put Russian in jail for nationalistic reasons while all other nationals were imprisoned, if their belief in the Soviet idea was not strong enough. I think it was based on race although it was masked as a class fight.

Prof Mignolo: So there is the underlying notion of dispensability of human life as an economic category, while genocide on the level of the state also includes the idea of elimination of an enemy. Be it Hitler’s Aryan state or Stalin’s communist state.

Prof Tlostanova: But Hitler tried to make Jews economically efficient as well. In concentration camps there was the McDonald’s logic – before Jews were killed they took everything of use and value from them – clothes, hair, teeth … Stalin made enemies build things, sometimes useless. They have built the Moscow State university.

**What about the genocide as a tool for eradication of culture or religion?**

Prof Mignolo: I think this in included in the notion of dispensability of the human life – be it organs or something else. Another thing is if these are used to present the enemy you want to eradicate. Islam or the criminal inside the society, or the Communists in the US during the Cold War. There seem to be two types of genocide – one motivated by economics – and here we do not have the notion of an enemy … it is just a tool.

Prof Tlostanova: You do not kill on purpose, it is a consequence of use.

Prof Mignolo: Yes, you have a horse to work or you have a slave to work. He is not your enemy – on the contrary, it is useful – it is a tool. You buy it, sell it, use it. A different kind of genocide is when you have to eradicate. However, eradication does not necessarily imply genocide. In colonial Peru there was eradication of ideology. They did not kill, they just converted to Christianity. They wanted to conquer souls.

Prof Tlostanova: That is why I think coloniality is wider and deeper than genocide. You can leave people alive but you wipe everything out of their minds to put something else there. In a way this is also a genocide – you leave them their physical lives but you take away their inside …

Prof Mignolo: We call it epistemic lobotomy. Now that I think of, the cleaning of ideology might had been a fore-runner of Hitler’s work. Except that Indians of the time were not the menace for Christian theologians like Jews were for Hitler. Christians are very clear of who their enemies are – at that moment in history it was Islam and Protestants. Catholics controlled the game but they wanted a dangerous enemy eager to destroy them – this was also the Bush discourse after the 9/11.

Prof Tlostanova: This is a very American discourse. It is the only way how to keep America together and form its national identity. To be together against someone. In Europe I think there is bigger common base of religion, roots, culture …

# SV O/W

**Mumia Abu-Jamal 1998** [“A QUIET AND DEADLY VIOLENCE,” 9/19/98, http://www.mumia.nl/TCCDMAJ/quietdv.htm]

It has often been observed that **America is a truly violent nation**, as shown by the thousands of cases of social and communal violence that occurs daily in the nation. **Every year**, some **20,000 people are killed by others, and** additional **20,000** folks **kill themselves**. Add to this the non lethal violence that Americans daily inflict on each other, and we begin to see the tracings of a nation immersed in a fever of violence. But, as remarkable, and harrowing as this level and degree of violence is, it is, by far, not the most violent feature of living in the midst of the American empire. **We live**, equally immersed, and to a deeper degree, **in a nation that condones and ignores wide-ranging "structural" violence**, of a kind **that destroys human life with a breathtaking ruthlessness**. Former Massachusetts prison official and writer, Dr. James Gilligan observes; **“By structural violence' I mean the increased rates of death and disability suffered by those who occupy the bottom rungs of society**, as contrasted by those who are above them. Those excess deaths (or at least a demonstrably large proportion of them) are a function of the class structure; and that structure is itself a product of society's collective human choices, concerning how to distribute the collective wealth of the society. These are not acts of God. I am contrasting `structural' with `behavioral violence' by which I mean the non-natural deaths and injuries that are caused by specific behavioral actions of individuals against individuals, such as the deaths we attribute to homicide, suicide, soldiers in warfare, capital punishment, and so on." -- (Gilligan, J., MD, Violence: Reflections On a National Epidemic (New York: Vintage, 1996), 192.) **This form of violence**, not covered by any of the majoritarian, corporate, ruling-class protected media, **is invisible** to us **and because of its invisibility, all the more insidious.** How dangerous is it -- really? Gilligan notes:  **"[E]very fifteen years**, on the average, **as many people die because of** relative **poverty as would be killed in a nuclear war** that caused 232 million deaths; **and every** single **year, two to three times as many people die from poverty throughout the world as were killed by the Nazi genocide** of the Jews over a six-year period. **This is**, in effect, **the equivalent of an ongoing,** unending, in fact **accelerating, thermonuclear war, or genocide on the weak and poor every year of every decade,** throughout the world." [Gillitgan, p. 196] Worse still, in a thoroughly capitalist society, much of **that violence became internalized**, turned back on the Self, **because, in a society based on the priority of wealth, those who own nothing are taught to loathe themselves, as if something is** inherently **wrong with themselves, instead of the social order** that promotes this self-loathing. **This** intense self-hatred was often **manifested in familial violence** as **when the husband beats the wife, the wife smacks the son,** and **the kids fight each other. This** vicious, **circular, and invisible violence**, unacknowledged by the corporate media, **uncriticized in** substandard **educational systems, and un- understood by the** very **folks who suffer in its grips, feeds on the** spectacular and **more common forms of violence** that **the system makes** damn sure -that we can recognize and must react to it. This fatal and systematic violence may be called The War on the Poor.It is found in every country, submerged beneath the sands of history, buried, yet ever present, as omnipotent as death. In the struggles over the commons in Europe, when the peasants struggled and lost their battles for their commonal lands (a precursor to similar struggles throughout Africa and the Americas), this violence was sanctified, by church and crown, as the 'Divine Right of Kings' to the spoils of class battle. Scholars Frances Fox-Piven and Richard A Cloward wrote, in The New Class War (Pantheon, 1982/1985): They did not lose because landowners were immune to burning and preaching and rioting. They lost because the usurpations of owners were regularly defended by the legal authority and the armed force of the state. It was the state that imposed increased taxes or enforced the payment of increased rents, and evicted or jailed those who could not pay the resulting debts. It was the state that made lawful the appropriation by landowners of the forests, streams, and commons, and imposed terrifying penalties on those who persisted in claiming the old rights to these resources. It was the state that freed serfs or emancipated sharecroppers only to leave them landless. (52) The "Law", then, was a tool of the powerful to protect their interests, then, as now. It was a weapon against the poor and impoverished, then, as now. It punished retail violence, while turning a blind eye to the wholesale violence daily done by their class masters. **The law** was, and **is,** a tool of state power, **utilized to protect the status quo, no matter how oppressive** that status was, or is. **Systems are** essentially **ways of doing things that have concretized into tradition,** and custom, **without regard to the rightness of those ways.////////// No system that causes this kind of harm to people should be allowed to remain,** based solely upon its time in existence. Systems must serve life, or be discarded as a threat and a danger to life. **Such systems must pass away, so** that **their** great and terrible **violence passes away with them.**

# Russel-Morris in ‘9

RUSSELL-MORRIS, GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY, 2009 (BRIANNE, THE LOGIC OF WELFARE REFORM: AN ANALYSIS OF THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND WORK OPPORTUNITYRECONCILIATION ACT OF 1996)

Discourse and policy go hand in hand, and so both must change in order for inequalities and thus poverty to be truly addressed. A change in poverty discourse must precede a change in antipoverty policy. New social welfare policy should be based in a discourse that promotes an understanding that inequality and poverty are entangled. The state must change fundamentally in order to address and to dismantle the sources of structural inequalities, such as neoliberal capitalism and patriarchal gender relations, rather than the individual outcomes of those inequalities. Both Schram (1995) and O’Connor (2001) call for a need to view discourse and structure as connected. In other words, we must focus on how policy and the language that is used to discuss and create that policy reinforce each other, and only then can we begin to move beyond such a limited discourse. O’Connor argues that poverty researchers must work independently of the State so that they “generate a genuinely independent and critical body of knowledge that aims to set rather than follow the agenda for policy debate” (2001:293). If knowledge is understood as part of larger cultural dynamics and their resulting economic, political, and social inequalities, poverty as a social problem is “de-pauperized” and will be taken seriously as a problem with structural, not behavioral, roots. Institutions, and not only the individual-level consequences of those institutions, would come under scrutiny and would be targeted for change (O’Connor 2001).

# 2NR Overview Round 6

**This debate was over after the 2AC when they made the mistake of reading arguments that aren’t responsive, from their language argument that we solve, to the lack of capital T truth, and beyond all assume we are making some sort of static claim about the world of the alternative, our argument is not that borders are bad our alternative is critical border thinking, this is to re-assess and re-interpret the ways in which forms of knowledge interact with each other, like US hegemony has empirically caused mass violence, because it sees populations who fall outside the bounds of their view of the world as disposable, that was our Spanos evidence**

**If we win the slightest risk the affs epistemology is bad you vote neg, because it means the way they have constructed the world is bad and leads to endless violence, which means they do not get their aff, because the fundamental basis of the aff is wrong. And even if they win the slightest risk of their advantage it is not enough of a risk to vote on, because we are winning a much larger risk of our kritik impacts.**

# 2NR Links

**This debate comes down to one big framing issue.**

**A - Epistemology: There are three reasons the affs is epistemologically bankrupt**

**1 - All of their extinction impacts are a way to posit the US as the savior of the world, this has several impacts.**

**First it justifies endless violence, because other people or countries that might stand in the way are seen as committing a crime against humanity, and become disposable. This also is an attempt to shield the aff from criticism by having you believe they are acting on the worlds behalf, this is western coloniality viewing the world as an object to be controlled causing a universal notion of humanity that enables certain to be members and deprives others who are not seen as useful. Just like in Iraq we used code words like "Operation Iraqi Freedom" as a means to justify the salvation of the Iraqi people, yet it lead to things like Bombing the entire city of Fallujah to the ground. The impact was not just physical violence it was also epistemic in the destruction of Iraqi culture and customs and forcing our democratic ways upon them, which has caused several millions of innocent civilian deaths. When they didn't accept the so-called salvation of the west it was and is still seen as a crime against humanity causing endless violence. This means even if they solve this one instance of extinction more people will die due to the continued violence of modernity as would ever die in a nuclear war.**

**2 – Our Lewis evidence indicates nuclear power has empirically lead to violence, and poses one of the greatest threats to indigenous cultures**

**Our alternative is critical border thinking is a stance against modernity, our Mignolo evidence says it is a process and is by definition broken, and does not see itself as superior and does not see other ideologies as inferior it is not inspired in its own limitations and does not intend to dominate or humiliate, it is fragmented, unachieved and because of this it is not ethnocidal.**

# 2NR Util

**Extend the Mignolo and Spanos evidence – both of these pieces of evidence are contextual to the question of utilitarianism and how Western modernity views the non-European other. Their evidence is about util in theory not in practice. The political logic of the affirmative constructs notions of acceptable humanity and privileges first world citizens before all else. This form of ethics makes genocide possible and inevitable. It strips life of any value and makes indiscriminate killing seen as a necessity. All of their arguments about the value to life do not answer these claims – non-European life is determined as having no value now. Only the alternative methodology can create a genuine politics that respects life.**

# 2NR Kato Link

**Extend our Kato evidence that indicates their constructions of nuclear war as a one-time event that causes extinction is only a way to gloss over the nuclear violence that is happening right now in the status quo, mainly driven by the U.S. against indigenous populations. It is the discursive strategy of apocalyptic scenarios that inherently privilege western society over non-western societies and mask nuclear violence, because it creates the justification to want to test more weapons so we are set for the all out war that is going to happen. This causes not only physical violence, but also epistemic violence that destroy cultures and the very way of life for people of that community. This also acts as terminal impact defense, because the only nuclear war that is going to happen anytime soon is the one happening right now, and the only instance of use of nuclear weapons in a war was the ones used on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which means it’s try-or-die for the alternative, and means even if they solve this one nuclear war it doesn’t nothing to change the epistemology that drives the kill to save mentality, which means thousands of genocides outweigh and will cause more deaths than their nuclear war.**

# 2NR Eckhardt

**Extend our Eckhardt evidence that indicates all of their impacts are inevitable, because the way the west and modernity expands ideals is by using wars and the domination is the most implicit element. It is this violence that has killed 20 times as many people in the 20th century as all wars and revolutions combined, this outweighs any impact they have, because the systemic nature of our impacts has killed more than their nuclear war would ever think about killing. Not to mention the structural violence caused by our impacts has caused one-third of all deaths as of the 20th century. This continual war makes nuclear war inevitable as we develop more and more destructive weapons just look at how the US military has evolved over time and the different tactics they have utilized.**

# 2NR Perm Debate

**1 - Cross-apply part of the link discussion from the overview those are all disads to the perm, because it proves the epistemology of the affirmative is tainted**

**2 - Explain any 2NC links read**

**3 - Our Deloria evidence says small reforms the perm offers by changing one component of the framework of Western thought, which has not changed in two millennia, rather our alternative is a complete break away from this ideology and takes the leap necessary to delink from this type of knowledge. This sets up the sequencing question that before we can engage the affirmative we have to remove their epistemic foundation before we can move forward.**

**4 - Our Smith evidence is on fire by saying you cannot end white supremacy, imperialism, or economic exploitation within the very structures of U.S. colonialism, the permutation rather sets up a short-term solution without consideration of the long term, only the altnerative that questions the legitimacy of the United States allows us to begin and form a world we actually want to live in.**