Global Peace  
Opposition Brief by Shoshanna Howey

**

*"Si vis pacem, para pacem." / "If you want peace, prepare for peace."*

When man first walked on the moon in 1969, I can only imagine the awe with which he viewed the earth. For the first time in human history, one of our own was viewing our world from the outside. One unified globe spun ceaselessly in the vast expanse of space. From a distance, the surface shimmered in a peaceful calm. But take one step into the reality of our world and you find that peace is a concept so foreign and vague, it is almost unconscionable.

The value of global peace, as set out by the affirmative, is appealing simply because it is impossible. Conflict has plagued humanity since its existence, and your judge will want to vote for the side that can eradicate it through their mindset and value. You can do one of two things to turn this persuasive impact to your side: either exploit the inadequacy of global peace as a moral standard for the round, simultaneously presenting a superior standard, or show how preemptive warfare necessarily contradicts global peace.

Opposition Brief: Global Peace

# Global peace is an inadequate standard for morality

Governments unable to achieve

McKillop, Kirsten. " The Philosopher’s Peace: Lasting or Final? Kant and Democratic Peace Theory." Published by the Institute for Human Sciences (which is an independent institute for the advanced study in the humanity and social sciences, founded in 1982 and based in Austria) in 2009. <http://www.iwm.at/publications/5-junior-visiting-fellows-conferences/vol-xxiii/kirsten-mckillop/>

Since the beginning of political philosophy, peace has been considered to be a high if not one of the highest ends of political action, but anyone looking to account for what we mean by peace faces the fact that we seem to understand peace not on its own terms but only in relation to its opposite, war. This oddity can seemingly be accounted for by noting the importance of the notion of nature as a “state of war” in the early modern conceptions of political philosophy, which has at least three important general consequences. First, since the reason for any common agreement in society is self-preservation, society comes to be considered as merely a means for the preservation of life. Second, since it is the peaceful state of political organization which makes it rational to exchange our natural warring relations with civil ones, peace comes to be associated with the principles of good or healthy governance. Third, although statehood comes to be associated with peace, nation states themselves remain subject to the state of nature. This idea comes from the proposal that nation states are, unlike individual citizens, not autonomous entities who can choose to be governed by peaceable rules. Rather, precisely because their first priority is the protection of their constituents, nation states are unable to make a lasting, peaceful contract amongst themselves. This entails that the question whether or not to go to war cannot be a moral question, since states are only morally obligated to ensure their own security. Thus it is a notable feature of every variation of modern traditional political theory – including both its ‘dove’ and ‘hawk’ adherents – that it is dominated by the debate about the nature and analysis of international hostilities, rather than about the peaceableness of humanity or of states.

Analysis: With nations necessarily looking out for their own interests, peace is impossible. It is crucial to remember that preemptive warfare is predicated on a "them vs. us" mindset (as indicated by the term "enemy attack" in the definition).

Impact: Global peace is impossible within the affirmative philosophy of the resolution.

Human nature unable to achieve

McKillop, Kirsten. " The Philosopher’s Peace: Lasting or Final? Kant and Democratic Peace Theory." Published by the Institute for Human Sciences (which is an independent institute for the advanced study in the humanity and social sciences, founded in 1982 and based in Austria) in 2009. <http://www.iwm.at/publications/5-junior-visiting-fellows-conferences/vol-xxiii/kirsten-mckillop/>

At the beginning of this paper I said that the notion of peace might be philosophically doubtful or worthless, and our earlier discussion of the circularity of peace is the main reason for this. We saw how society may be considered to be good if it is peaceful, but that its peacefulness is also something that is desired. It is only secure in so far as everyone desires it. Peacefulness is thus itself a matter of the will, or of the good will in Kant’s vocabulary. The trouble with this picture is that it is not obvious that the good will is actually peaceful. There is no doubt that “peace” – our belief and hope in this possibility – has enormous psychological and political importance, but this is not what is at issue. Our passion for peace has been proved to be a strong ingredient in the motive for war. The nut of Kant’s belief that peace is possible is his belief that our individual ideas of goodness and happiness will remain uncontested because of an agreement that we make on the basis of our knowledge that it is good to avoid war. Closer examination shows however, that this is not the only, and not a sufficient, basis for this agreement. Rather the agreement regarding the disadvantage of war stands on the claim that individual ideas of goodness and happiness are not politically functional. Thus, the practical conception of politics and of peace involves, as we noticed before, that we reject the idea that the aim of society is human happiness. This result in turn guarantees that the genuine ends of politics are conceived as being achievable because the ends that are sought are determined beforehand as goals that are practically possible.

Analysis: Building off of the premise that humanity is bent towards evil, rather than good, McKillop demonstrates that the purpose of society is not necessarily postured towards peace.

Impact: Human nature is incapable of fostering a world where peace can flourish on a global scale.

# Weapons of mass destruction

It’s important to highlight for the judge the rise of human destructive capabilities. Rather than setting ourselves towards peace, we have, in the last century, perfected the fine art of mass destruction. In light of the following tangible evidence, it is conceivable that neither governments nor humanity is capable of achieving absolute, worldwide peace.

Chemical warfare

Ganesan, K., Raza, S. K., Vijayaraghavan, R. "Chemical warfare agents." Published by the National Center for Biotechnology Information, Journal of Pharmacy and BioAllied Services, Volume 2, Issue 3, Jul-Sep, 2010. pp. 165-178. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3148621/>

Thus, the birth of modern CW was ushered in by the German gas attack with chlorine on 22nd April 1915 at Ypres, Belgium. The use of these toxic chemicals, including phosgene, sulfur mustard and lewisites caused 100,000 deaths and 1.2 million casualties in World War I (WWI). Millions of innocent civilians were killed by the Nazis with Zyklon B gas (hydrogen cyanide gas) during World War II. Agent Orange – a defoliant – was used by the USA during the Vietnam War. The only major use of CW since WWI occurred during the Iran–Iraq War in the 1980s. The largest single CW attack killing around 5,000 people followed an Iraqi nerve agent attack on the Kurdish civilian population of Halabja. This attack illustrates the one single characteristic of CW agents that allows them to be considered as WMD. This incident, together with the relative simplicity of their production, makes them an attractive terrorist weapon. This has been made particularly evident by the Sarin attacks by a Japanese cult in Matsumoto city (1994) and the Tokyo subway system (1995), causing 5,500 injuries and 12 deaths. The threat of using CW agents in domestic terrorist attack was demonstrated for the first time in these cases. However, mass casualties were prevented not as a consequence of the medical response but because of the inefficiency of the delivery method. Subsequent investigations revealed that the sect had also produced Tabun, Soman, Vx and Botulinum toxin. Thus, even small groups of individuals can use CW agents to create massive and extensive human suffering without any warning.

Nuclear warfare

BBC, "Fact File: Hiroshima and Nagasaki." Published June 2003 - January 2006. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/ww2peopleswar/timeline/factfiles/nonflash/a6652262.shtml>

On the morning of 6 August 1945 an American B-29 bomber, the 'Enola Gay', dropped the first atomic bomb used in warfare on the Japanese city of Hiroshima. The bomb was dropped by parachute and exploded 580m (1,900ft) above the ground. Between 60,000 and 80,000 people were killed instantly. The heat from the bomb was so intense that some people simply vanished in the explosion. Many more died of the long-term effects of radiation sickness. The final death toll was calculated at 135,000. As well as residents of Hiroshima, the victims included Koreans who had been forced to come to Japan as labourers, and American prisoners-of-war who were imprisoned in Hiroshima. The blast destroyed more than ten square kilometres (six square miles) of the city. And the intense heat of the explosion then created many fires, which consumed Hiroshima and lasted for three days, trapping and killing many of the survivors of the initial blast. Thousands of people were made homeless and fled the devastated city. Hiroshima was chosen because it had not been targeted during the US Air Force's conventional bombing raids on Japan, and was therefore regarded as being a suitable place to test the effects of an atomic bomb. It was also an important military base. The Allies feared that any conventional attempt to invade the Japanese home islands would result in enormous casualties, and the bomb was seen as a way of bringing the war against Japan to a swift conclusion. In addition, it may also have been a way of demonstrating American military superiority over the Soviet Union. On the morning of 9 August, the Americans dropped a second, bigger atomic bomb. The original target was Kokura, but this was obscured by cloud so the bomb was dropped on nearby Nagasaki, an important port. About 40,000 people were killed instantly and a third of the city was destroyed. The final death toll was calculated as at least 50,000.

Biological warfare

Federation of American Scientists, "Biological Weapons Program." (The FAS is a nuclear disarmament group, founded in 1945 by scientists who built atomic bombs during the Manhattan Project.) <https://fas.org/nuke/guide/japan/bw/>

From 1938-1945 Ishii carried on experiments against POW's, including US forces at the Mukden POW Camp in northeast China. He directed Unit 731, the secret Japanese unit engaged in human experimentation. Ishii was initially given command of the "Togo Unit" of 300 men, which rapidly grew and acquired additional "cover" identities. The first major BW facility was built at Beiyinhe, some 70km outside Harbin, known locally as the "Zhong Ma Prison Camp. Open air testing on prisoners was conducted at the the officially named "Water Purification Unit 731" at Pingfan near Harbin, a remote, desolate area on the Manchurian Peninsula. Pingfan's 6 square kilometers housed more than 150 buildings, including administrative buildings, laboratories, workers dormitories, and barracks. By 1945, the Japanese program had stockpiled 400 kilograms of anthrax to be used in a specially designed fragmentation bomb. Studies continued there until 1945, when the Unit 731 complex was leveled by burning it. Slightly less than 1,000 human autopsies apparently were carried out at Unit 731, most on victims exposed to aerosolized anthrax. Many more prisoners and Chinese nationals may have died in this facility - some have estimated up to 3,000 human deaths. In 1940, a plague epidemic in China and Manchuria followed reported overflights by Japanese planes dropping plague-infected fleas. The Japanese attacked hundreds of heavily populated communities and remote regions with germ bombs. There appears to have been a massive germ war campaign in Yunnan Province bordering Burma. Planes dropped plague-infected fleas over Ningbo in eastern China and over Changde in north-central China, Japanese troops also dropped cholera and typhoid cultures in wells and ponds. In all, tens of thousands, and perhaps as many 200,000, Chinese died of bubonic plague, cholera, anthrax and other diseases.

Analysis: In order for the affirmative's claim that global peace is achievable to be accepted, the judge must believe that mankind has the capacity to bend itself towards such a high moral standard. In the last hundred years, man has demonstrated a ferocious capacity, not for the better, but for the worse.

Impact: These arguments all tie back to your value system. Showcase to the judge how yours overcomes the affirmative's failings. Your value, to successfully run these responses, must be more achievable, practical, and tangible.

# Global peace is impossible with preemptive warfare

The irony of this value framework is that voting for the affirmative requires voting for peace to be broken prematurely.

Preemptive warfare is unnecessary in the pursuit of peace

Aron, Raymond. "Peace and War: A Theory of International Relations." (Raymond Aron is a professor of sociology at Sorbonne University in Paris, France.) Published by Routledge in May 2, 2003. pp. 365-366.

The human animal is aggressive, but it does not fight by instinct, and war is an expression, it is not a necessary expression of human combativity. War has been its constant expression in the course of the historical phase, starting from the moment when societies were organized and armed. It is contrary to the nature of man that the danger of violence be definitively dispelled: in every collectivity, misfits will violate the laws and attack persons. It is contrary to the nature of individual and groups that the conflicts between individuals or among groups disappear. But it is not proved that these conflicts must be manifested in the phenomenon of war, as we have known it for thousands of years, with organized combatants, utilizing increasingly destructive weapons.

Preemptive warfare discourages diplomacy

Stanley, Ryan K. Naval Cadet. "The Consequences of Preemption." Published by the Royal Military College of Canada. (The RMCC is the military college of the Canadian Armed Forces, founded in 1876.) <http://isme.tamu.edu/JSCOPE05/Stanley05.html>

Proper use of communication and deterrence can overt the need to preempt a hostile state. Jervis (1976) points out that it is not inevitable that the hostility between two states must escalate to war. He describes two models were war between two states can be avoided if handled properly. First, the spiral model demonstrates that two states may act in response to the other’s militarization until the conflict escalates out of control. This occurred in WWI, when there was an arms race for the Dreadnought between Britain and Germany. Britain attempted to overcome the need to out-build one another by having each side announce its intentions and set the number of ships to be built at a reasonable level. Germany declined this proposal and Britain increased the problem by failing to reassure Germany of its own building plans. To counter the potential negative effects of escalation, intentions of peace must be communicated so that each state does not perceive the others’ actions as aggressive. The impetus to avoid war is placed on each state to justify its own actions as defensive and not aggressive. It should not be expected for either state to interpret the others’ actions as peaceful; it is the responsibility of each state to clearly communicate it own intentions for peace.

Preemptive warfare escalates conflict

Stanley, Ryan K. Naval Cadet. "The Consequences of Preemption." Published by the Royal Military College of Canada. (The RMCC is the military college of the Canadian Armed Forces, founded in 1876.) <http://isme.tamu.edu/JSCOPE05/Stanley05.html>

For preemption to be avoided, deterrence has to be strong enough to overcome the incentive to attack, while communication must build enough trust to decrease the perception of threat. Axelrod characterizes the problem of preemption in terms of a Prisoners’ Dilemma. Although war is avoidable, no state wants to be attacked first even if it has nothing to gain from a war. Both sides have a fear of being attacked first and thus there is an urge to gain the advantage by attacking first. When two states come into conflict, there can be four outcomes. Both states could refrain from the use of preemption and equally gain in avoiding a needless war. Alternatively, either state could use preemptive force with the fear that they themselves will be preempted. Attacking in fear of attack results from what Thomas Schelling describes as ‘reciprocal fear of surprise attack.’ Each side fears that the other will attack first and gain a possible advantage over the outcome of a war. One of the main concerns in the Cold War was that a false alarm in one country could provoke an attack from the other in the belief they were the target of a preemptive offensive. If either state resorts to preemption, both states lose. But, at the same time, the side that strikes first may only face the cost of war and not the cost of losing a war. If there is enough trust and deterrence between two states, neither will attack, and both will win. But, since there is always the chance that one state is planning a secret attack to catch the other off guard, the least risky option of attacking first is the logical choice. Reciprocal fear of attack may force both sides to aggression despite the ability to avoid war.

Preemptive warfare discourages long-term international stability

Stanley, Ryan K. Naval Cadet. "The Consequences of Preemption." Published by the Royal Military College of Canada. (The RMCC is the military college of the Canadian Armed Forces, founded in 1876.) <http://isme.tamu.edu/JSCOPE05/Stanley05.html>

The solution to this dilemma is to focus on long-term interactions rather than short-term risks. In a single interaction, the logical action is to attack first, since whether the other side attacks or moves for peace, the attacking side is better off than being attacked. However, in protracted long-term interactions, if both sides only move to attack first, the gains that would have been made from long-term cooperation are lost. Thus, in order to avoid the temptation of preemption, the long-term outcome must be calculated. Preemption is a poor strategy as it fails to take in consideration the result it will have in the future. By using preemptive force, other states are less likely to trust a state in future interactions making the urge to preempt all the more difficult to avoid. While preemption is, in theory justified, the long-term outcome is that everyone is anticipating the use of preemption and as a result, preempts in self-defense. Instead of preemption increasing the security of a state, the long-term result is more incidents of preemption being used against the state because of an inability to escape a Prisoners’ Dilemma without the trust required.

Analysis: Preemptive warfare fosters a community of fear in which nations are more afraid that they will be preemptively struck than they are capable of developing rational, diplomatic, peace-producing solutions.

Impact: Preemptive warfare cannot uphold long-term global peace.

If you want peace, prepare for peace, not war

Rotblat, Joseph, and Ikeda, Daisaku, "A Quest for Global Peace: Rotblat and Ikeda on War, Ethics and the Nuclear Threat." (Sir Joseph Rotblat, Nobel Laureate, was one of the scientists who worked on the nuclear program, eventually changing his mindset to disarmament. Ikeda was the president of the Saka Gakkai in Japan.) Published by I.B.Taurus, Dec. 26, 2006. p. 3.

Yes, indeed. Our only salvation from extinction is to make choices that ensure the realization of a peaceful world. For many years security in the world was governed by the ancient Roman dicturn, Si vis pacem, para bellum (If you wish for peace, prepare for war). Given the general acceptance of this conventional wisdom, the attitude of people these days is not surprising. However, as history tells us, it is an indisputable reality that preparations for war have generally led to war. Despite this, we have insisted on putting our faith in this premise. If humanity hopes to survive into the third millennium, we must rewrite the ancient Roman dictum to read, Si vis pacem, para pacem (If you wish for peace, prepare for peace). Each of us is a member of the human family, and we enjoy our lives within this context. For this reason, we must never forget that we have a duty and a responsibility to make sure that this human community endures.

Analysis: As the negative, you have the opportunity to champion global peace, through avoiding preemptive warfare.

Impact: Illustrate to the judge the logical contradictions of the affirmative upholding peace through war, and the true solution that lies in the negative philosophy.