# New Affs bad

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose the aff at least 30 minutes before the round – to clarify, this can be informal disclosure Violation is in the doc

#### Graphical user interface, application, Teams Description automatically generated standards 1 - forces us to rely on generics rather than strategies tailored to the affirmative— kills nuanced clash and turns their education arguments since every debate is the same.

#### 2- they get infinite time to frontline their aff, while I come into the round guessing – kills fairness 3 - discourages cheap shot aff’s. If the aff isn’t inherent or easily defeated by 20 minutes of research, the case should lose- surprise factor affs are bad- incentivizes cases that are as fringe as possible instead of well-researched realistic affirmatives- incentivizes useless education

#### Voters

#### fairness -we can’t determine truth of arguments if they’re not tested fairly

#### education -only reason why schools fund debate

#### Ci offense isn't competitive because you can still read new affs- just disclose them. critical thinking is non-unique because people would still have to come up with answers to the aff before the round.

#### Drop the debater on new affs- the theory is on the entire aff so dta means they lose

#### Competing interps, reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention

#### NO RVI A. incentives good theory debaters to bait abuse b- chills debaters from running theory on good teams even if they deserve it

# Daoism

#### Welcome to the age of acceleration. Crises of reification are tearing apart the way we experience and our present theories aren’t gonna save us. Only Daoism can defeat the cycle

Wenning, Mario (2011), "Daoism as Critical Theory", Comparative Philosophy, ,

https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1017&context=comparativephilosophy. Accessed on July 15, 2021. r0w@n

Pathologies are social and psychological deformations on a structural level manifesting themselves in social institutions, individual patterns of beliefs, motivations and practices. The pathologies which critical theory has been diagnosing can be summarized, following Marx, Lukacs and Weber, as a combination of reification, disenchantment and acceleration. In the process of increasingly understanding intersubjective-, self- and world-relationships primarily from the perspective of exchanging equivalent commodities on a market governed increasingly, and sometimes exclusively, by a competition for these commodities, individuals become systematically estranged from the objects they produce, the process of production, themselves, and from the community of fellow human beings.12 The pathology of reification (Verdinglichung) arising from the exchange principle governing ever more dimensions of society has been analyzed, drawing on the early Marx and Lukacs, from a variety of perspectives.13 Originally reification referred to the process of making singular human beings and experiences similar and exchangeable by abstracting from their unique qualities. While the concept seemed outdated for a long time due to its implicit assumption of a human essence from which one could become estranged, it made an astonishing comeback. Whether it is a critique of the reification/distortion of communication,14 the reification of relationships of intersubjective recognition,15 the reification of gender roles16 or the 12 Karl Marx (1973, 108-111). 13 See for example Axel Honneth, (2005). 14 Jürgen Habermas (1984). 15 Axel Honneth (1996). 57 Comparative Philosophy 2.2 (2011) WENNING reification of conceptions of the self,17 what is being criticized are relationships primarily controlled by a fixed logic of instrumental reason and strategic bargaining processes rather than mutual understanding, recognition, care for the self, love and other preconditions of leading a good life within the constraints of justice. Apart from the attempts to shed light on reification as a major form of pathology in modern societies, it is a significant success of recent work in critical social theory to emphasize that not all pathologies of modernity can be reduced to intersubjective pathologies of communication and reification.18 People in late modern societies do not just suffer from being used rather than understood or being invisible rather than recognized. They also suffer from what Max Weber called ‗disenchantment‘ (Entzauberung). In the process of increased rationalization, traditional sources of meaning that were sedimented in inherited religious traditions, social institutions and customs have lost their power in orienting lives. Finally, **the process that reification and the vanishing of resources of meaning have been engaged in is one of an increasing acceleration** (Beschleunigung) in which, as Marx puts it, ―everything that is solid melts into the air‖. We witness a progressively increasing speed not only of technological innovation, but of social change since the late medieval period. While there was an intergenerational speed of change in the early modern period, and a generational speed of change during classical and high modernity, **late modernity is characterized by an intragenerational speed of change** in which **the basic parameters of coordinating one‘s life change within a lifetime.** In this latest stage of acceleration, the only thing that is certain is that what was taken to be certain today might not be certain tomorrow.19 This acceleration is both subjectively experienced and corresponds to objective modes of accelerated life ranging from processing information, the transportation of goods and people, voting behavior to the change of significant others and professions. Increased change of environments and values undermines traditional forms of identity formation since actors are forced to constantly reassess and readjust their forms of life, practices and sets of convictions. All three pathologies constitute forms of social injury. While the psychological impact of **reification leads to systematic forms** of forced inclusion or exclusion, **of being restricted to or being left out of fixed identities**, and the process of disenchantment corresponds to a sense of existential absurdity in a world devoid of binding resources of meaning, the pressures of increasing acceleration are experienced in terms of existential exhaustion and anxiety. As a consequence, there is an increased sense of superfluousness and being antiquated, a fear to be left behind in, or fall outside of the rushing hamster's wheel of late modern societies. . However distinct these pathologies might appear, it is crucial to notice that there is a close linkage between these three briefly outlined pathological tendencies of modern societies. Not only are reification, disenchantment and acceleration historically connected, they also imply each other on a conceptual level. Reification consists in seeing the world primarily from the vantage point of being a means or a toolbox from which means can be utilized in order to bring about a desired end. In this objectifying process, the end justifies the variable means and is the only factor taken to be intrinsically valuable. This end, then, is understood as not presently realized but as a future possibility the reality of which depends on the implementation of one's plan of action. Bernard Williams, the eminent British moral philosopher, stresses this point by arguing that without projecting an aim into the future, life would become meaningless. He argues for ―the idea of a man's ground projects providing the motive force which propels him into the future, and gives him a reason for living.‖20 If it were the case that our very existence would be safeguarded only as long as we intentionally pursue future-directed goals and projects in increasingly rationalized ways, it would mean that actors would be doomed to be increasingly alienated from a present they could at best regard as offering instrumentally useful, but intrinsically insignificant means for a supposedly meaningful future. Seen from the temporal horizon of the actor engaged in instrumental reasoning and action, the present events, actions, objects and subjects lack any intrinsic value. They are regarded as merely ―useful for‖ certain projects rather than significant in virtue of what they are. The moment a project is realized, the satisfaction vanishes since it is not futural anymore. By presupposing such a restricted conception of projective action as the reason for living, the present environment an actor navigates in is transformed into pure immanence in which prediction becomes possible to the point of resembling an analytic judgment: assuming that we know what we want, and if we can do what we want while nobody keeps us from doing it, what we want will become realized. Novelty is being reduced to the discovery of new implications of what has already been familiar. Effort is generated once we see the end of our action as external to our spontaneously generated attachments. It grows out of the attempt to realize the stipulated end in ever more innovative, efficient and predictable ways in which spontaneity is, at best, forced towards a goal. The goal at which effort is directed often drops out of focus during the acceleration process or it loses its appeal. It seems external to the actor who has been trapped in a means-ends apparatus. This rationalization process increasingly becomes independent from the specificity of ends pursued and impossible to get out of. With every rationalized act the actor moves deeper into the quicksand of a world of suppressed spontaneity. The consequence of this seemingly autonomous rationalization process famously described by Weber as an ―iron cage‖ is that the present is being downgraded as insignificant on its own terms when compared to the future gains one promises oneself as the payoff of one's actions. Processes of innovation become the norm and speed up because actors hope to do and achieve ever more goals in increasingly shorter segments of emptied time. Actors rush to a future, which can in principle never be actualized. Paul Virillio fittingly describes this blind acceleration process of chasing structurally elusive future goals in increasingly higher speeds of innovation adequately as a ―rushing standstill‖. From within the ―iron cage‖ of modernity true innovation, which would have to be different from mere acceleration or enhancement and would require deliberating about alternative present ends, seems increasingly impossible.21 The new is transfigured into the only variable that is to be expected. Instrumental action as the reified forgetfulness of the meaning resources of the present for the sake of the projected future thus seems without alternative. The consequence is what Hermann Lübbe refers to as a ‗Gegenwartsschrumpfung‘, a continuing shrinking of the present under the complimentary pressures of the tendencies of melancholic musealization of irretrievably lost pasts and forced innovation to run after structurally elusive futures.22 The dilemma with which critical theorists see themselves confronted is that whatever emancipatory tendencies – be they introduced as forms of resistance, mutual understanding, recognition etc. – are being proposed as means for a future end, instrumental action is reenacted under a normative guise and the domination of the future over the rest of time is thus further sedimented. As soon as instrumental actors propose or just point to emancipatory forms of action, they replicate and reenact the same temporal logic that it originally diagnosed as the problem of modernity, i.e., the belief that the future can be mastered through acts of projective planning. The problem of this projective planning mentality is not that things often turn out differently than planned, but that the actor sidesteps and thereby undermines the significance of the present and sees it simply as something to be used for future ends. In other words, by downgrading the present including its modes of action to being "for the sake of the future," critical theory denigrates the present to the status of a prefuture, a state of emptiness that is used as a resource rather than lived in. A theory exposing and explaining social pathologies is keen on pointing to the inescapable mechanisms preventing the emancipatory use of reason through action. Such an exclusive focus on the diagnosis and emergence of pathologies coincides with developing an ethics of melancholy that emphasizes the inescapable specter of instrumental reason. Looking back in a melancholy state of mind over the long history of failed revolutions, it only sees what has been irretrievably lost in the wake of histories of catastrophes.23 The present is now seen as an appendix to a past larger than life, an after-past. By replacing the search for an alternative mode of present potentiality with a focus on the traumatic experiences of history, it forecloses the possibility of emancipatory action in the present and thereby reverses the temporal logic of modernity. By replacing the infatuation of the projected future over the present, a new domination – that of the past over the present – is being introduced and sedimented. While the former domination – that of the future over the present - corresponded to forms of blind activism, the latter – that of the past over the present - leads to a state of passivity, an inhibition, which replaces the engagement with the present for the contemplation of mnemonic art. The consequence is not a liberation of the past (which is in principle impossible) or a liberation of the present, but an extension of the temporal pressure put on the present. While the classical modernists only had to justify themselves with respect to the future, late modernists also have to justify themselves with respect to the past. This detour was intended to show that the instrumental actor finds himself in a dilemma that seems impossible to get out off. The shrinking of the present arising out of instrumental action constitutes a theoretical as well as practical impasse. A transcultural engagement with Daoism understood as another critical theory could turn out to be fruitful given that it emerged within a cultural context in which instrumental action has not been the only or even primary form of action. First, however, it needs to be asked whether it is at all legitimate to interpret Daoism as another critical theory. In the second part of the paper I will first show that Daoism can be understood as a critical theory and then discuss whether it offers an insight that could overcome the uneasy relationship between critical theory and emancipatory action with a focus on the present. The goal is to show that the proto-Daoists Lao Zi and Zhuang Zi, commonly referred to as "Lao-Zhuang", provide a promising path which points to an alternative approach of addressing the vexing problem of instrumental action expressing itself in the pathologies of reification, disenchantment and acceleration. At the risk of engaging in anachronistic hermeneutics by applying texts from a different tradition which date back two and a half-millennia, the benefits of tapping rich conceptual sources providing a new insight into entrenched philosophical preconceptions seem overwhelming. Compared to European traditions, Daoism's long history of addressing phenomena of reification and change in theoretical, as well as practical ways, provides an immense richness not only for a reorientation of critical theory, but also in terms of envisioning emancipatory practices. The insight into the fluidity of social dynamics and the fluid subjectivity of actors anticipates many of the developments of late modern societies. At the same time Daoism offers us correctives to these developments. The early Daoist acknowledgment of the value of idling and uselessness, for example, allows us to level a critique of the pathologies of reification, disenchantment and acceleration deriving from a reduction of action to instrumental action. A critical theory in the spirit of Daoism would not simply disclose pathologies. It would also offer constructive resources which allow us to critically address and, as far as possible, overcome these pathologies without providing yet another reifying project that sells out on the potentiality of the present for the sake of the future.

#### The world is constantly changing, flowing, and becoming – action is only coherent in the specific circumstances of the present

Ames and Hall 10. Roger Ames and David Hall (Ames is a Canadian philosopher at the University of Peking. Hall was a professor of philosophy at the University of Texas), 2010, “Daodejing: Making this Life Significant,” Ballantine Books, I have a pdf, sean!

We begin our argument for translating Daodejing as “Making This Life Signicant” from Daoist cosmology. Taking a closer look at the interpretation of both the title and the content of the Daodejing as “The Classic of This Focus (de page24image2425456) and Its Field (dao page24image2425040),” we might first ask what does the expression “this focus” mean? The Daoist correlative cosmology begins from the assumption that the endless stream of always novel yet still continuous situations we encounter are real, and hence, that there is ontological parity among the things and events that constitute our lives. As a parody on Parmenides, who claimed that “only Being is,” we might say that for the Daoist, “only beings are,” or taking one step further in underscoring the reality of the process of change itself, “only becomings are.” That is, the Daoist does not posit the existence of some permanent reality behind appearances, some unchanging substratum, some essential denying aspect behind the accidents of change. Rather, there is just the ceaseless and usually cadenced flow of experience. In fact, the absence of the “One behind the many” metaphysics makes our uncritical use of the philosophic term “cosmology” to characterize Daoism, at least in the familiar classical Greek sense of this word, highly problematic. In early Greek philosophy, the term “kosmos” connotes a clustered range of meanings, including arche (originative, material, and efficient cause/ultimate undemonstrable principle), logos (underlying organizational principle), theoria (contemplation), nomos (law), theios (divinity), nous (intelligibility). In combination, this cluster of terms conjures forth some notion of a single-ordered Divine3 universe governed by natural and moral laws that are ultimately intelligible to the human mind. This “kosmos” terminology is culturally specfiic, and if applied uncritically to discuss the classical Daoist worldview, introduces a cultural reductionism that elides and thus conceals truly significant differences. The Daoist understanding of “cosmos” as the “ten thousand things” means that, in effect, the Daoists have no concept of cosmos at all insofar as that notion entails a coherent, single-ordered world which is in any sense enclosed or denied. The Daoists are, therefore, primarily, “acosmotic” thinkers.

#### The Links:

#### Rationalism blinds us to specific circumstances, not to the flow of the universe, to the people, or to any policy options outside of the standard

Pettman 05, Ralf Pettman, Taoism and The Concept of Global Security, International Relations of the Asian-Pacific, 2005, <https://sci-hub.se/https://doi.org/10.1093/irap/lci103>, r0w@n

Specific comparisons of Taoist and non-Taoist approaches to global security Having briefly tried to define Taoism and the Tao, and having indicated some of the problems that arise in trying to doing so, I shall now move to the nub of the matter, which is to compare Taoism and rationalism in epistemological terms. I will then compare Taoist thinking with more rationalist thinking about global security in ‘human’ terms, and then with rationalist thinking about global security in more conventional terms. 4.1 Comparing Taoist and rationalist epistemologies The profundity of the concept of the Tao seems to preclude us from using Taoism to describe its meaning in logical, empirical, analytical terms. As a consequence we are typically invited to talk in analogical and metaphorical terms instead. But this is to jeopardize at once the sympathy of most contemporary social scientists, who as a group are likely to require something much more publicly verifiable before considering it reliable. Rationalists are not about to content themselves with accounts of an aptitude for living 6 The story is that of the drunk who returns home at night and loses his key while trying to open the front door to his home. He is subsequently found by a neighbour looking under a lamplight some distance away. After asking what the drunk is doing, and where he lost his key, the neighbour then asks why the drunk is not looking outside his front door. The drunk replies to the effect that the light is brighter under the lamp. Taoism and the concept of global security 71 expressed in ‘stories, verses, maxims’ and the like (Graham, 1989, pp. 199– 200; Giles, 1961 [1889]) If historically or philosophically minded, they will want to be more systematic. If positivists, they will want to use the hypothetico-deductive method. So let us be clear. Rationalism, which is the doctrine within which most thinking and practice about the concept of global security is currently done, prioritizes reason as an end in itself. Taoism, which is the doctrine I am trying to bring to bear upon the rationalist construction of this concept, is a way of thinking and practice that does not. It prioritizes sacral (and in this instance, Taoist) insights instead. These two are seemingly incommensurable. They would seem to represent an unbridgeable epistemological divide. Their protagonists not only talk different analytical languages, they talk past each other as well, which is just what I want to prevent, not just because I do not like dialogues of the deaf, but more importantly, because I think it is to capitulate to rationalism. From the rationalist perspective, Taoism looks anti-rational. As such, it is at best interesting. It is not reliable knowledge. From the Taoist perspective, however, rationalism is what one does with the rational part of one’s mind. It is only part of what Taoists do, nor need it be the larger part, since it includes the injunction to live in a state of sacral spontaneity. I noted above that rationalism is compromised at its root by the kind of self that is required if rationalism is to succeed. I argued that the individuated self – at one mind’s remove from the community – is objectifying. This self is created in turn by learning to be mentally distanced from the communalist context into which ‘one’ was born. Rationalism valorizes this individuated self, typically turning it into a primary normative purpose. Because this bias is built into rationalism itself, and because it limits and distorts so thoroughly what rationalism can do, we have to go outside rationalism to compensate for it. Otherwise, whenever we use rationalism, we will get the world right, but we will also get the world wrong. The most straightforward compensation procedure I know is one that enjoins us to get close to listen, and to take part, that is, to actively eschew the objectifying mind-gaze to participate in what one wants to understand. Anthropologists do this when they immerse themselves in a society not their own. The compensation bid need not stop there, however. It can be carried over from the social ground to the sacral one (and in this case the Taoist one), thus providing the kind of insight not otherwise available to rationalists because of how they choose to know. Those rationalists who get this far will no doubt want to follow their Taoist insights up by considering them rationally, but at least they will have Taoist insights to follow up. At least, having accepted immersion in the ‘shal- 72 Ralph Pettman low’ or meditative end of the experiential pool,7 or even beyond, they may have learned what otherwise they would not have been able to. The rationalist may even want to follow this up with further attempts to take part, and further rationalist reappraisals. By which point we will have constructed a cycle of knowing that is already rolling rationalism forward across the epistemological divide. We are still faced with fundamental uncertainty about the ground on which we stand (though most natural scientists will remain oblivious, and many social scientists likewise.) By eternally returning to both rationalism and Taoism, however, we no longer have to set the one up in opposition to the other. We do not have to abandon our regard for rigour, or our preference for specified indices of comparison, or for reassessing sacral insights in non-sacral ways. But nor do we have to abandon the idea that Taoism has something meaningful to say about the concept of global security. The two are no longer placed in contention, since to place them thus is to cleave to the rationalist line as the surest way to know what is true, and to ignore the way the ontological character of rationalism compromises any such surety. While we are used to having sacral illusion dispelled by analytic clarity, we are not so used to having analytic illusion dispelled by sacral clarity. That is the task before us, however, and it is a task with normative implications considerably more extensive than those rationalists would valorize. How does moving onto Taoist ground, and immersing ourselves in Taoist experience, play out in practice? Our section on mapping the concept of global security began by highlighting the making of modernity. If we start with this general project, and cast it in the light of the general Taoist knack for sacral spontaneity, we see at once how little this knack has to do with the rationalist way of thinking or being. Where the modernist/rationalist talks of empirical logic and scientific representation, the sacralist/Taoist talks (in Graham’s terms, at least) of the rejection of empirical logic, and an ‘infinite regress, testing by tests which in the end are themselves untested’ (Graham, 7 Arriving at Taoist precepts requires the use of what Waley calls ‘quietism’, or the ‘gradual inward-turning of . . . thought’ (Waley, 1934, pp. 43, 45). This involves the use of the mind in non-rationalist, indeed anti-rationalist ways, that allow it to become less distracted and more aware. For rationalists, meditation as a research methodology is too subjective. Why should we accept the results of Taoist quietism, they say, as a way to plan global security, for example, when we can use rationalist bargaining strategies and mediation practices instead? Why, for that matter, should we treat exploitation or global destitution or environmental neglect with meditative detachment, rather than with objective plans for changing the world for the better? Why should we use non-rational illumination to help rulers order the inter-state system when we have publically replicable ways of thinking that allow us to do so scientifically (Graham, 1989, p. 234)? Taoists respond by comparing their accounts of the world with modernist ones. They point out how modernist state-makers are taught to understand world affairs by objectifying. They point out how knowing of this sort is circumscribed by the nature of the primary experience that makes untrammelled reasoning possible (individuation). And they see themselves as eschewing these limits by inviting a different kind of primary experience. Taoism and the concept of global security 73 1981, pp. 10, 11). Where the rationalist talks of the hypothetico-deductive method, the Taoist talks (again in Graham’s terms) of an understanding of the ‘mysterious order which runs through all things’, and the universal motion of chi energy (Graham, 1981, pp. 12, 19–20). Where the rationalist talks of a detached and individuated intellectual vantage-point, separate from society, where reason can be given free reign to cogitate and communicate, the Taoist talks (in Hansen’s terms this time) of ‘heart-minds’ (Hansen, 1992, pp. 53, 85–86). Taoists respond to the situation they are in by unfocusing, that is, by allowing themselves to act with the ‘immediacy of an echo’, rather than the self-consciousness of someone who applies general principles. (Graham, 1981, pp. 6, 12, 14). They invite, in other words, the kind of recognition the ‘heart’ gives ‘when the mind is silent’ (Krishnamurti, 1972, p. 34). This is metaphorical language, but we are not, after all, trying to ascertain what is scientifically true. We are trying to locate scientific truth-finding within its sacral context.8 Faced with global security planning, Taoists highlight the way rationalist attempts to anticipate a particular foreign policy can only reach so far. Taoists highlight how those who really know what they are doing tend to eschew conscious thought to attend instead to the ‘total situation’. This ‘knack’, like a feel for the way a bacterium works, or for how to play a musical instrument, is not one that can be ultimately explained (Graham, 1983, p. 7). Taoists also compare the way they face the future with the way it is faced by those who promote the national interest, for example, or the relevant capitalist/corporate, politico-social, bourgeois, or masculinist interest. The rationalist entertains options A, B, and C, and plays out each one in advance, in a bid to anticipate what will turn out the best. Except that it is not possible to anticipate what will turn out the best. In choosing one policy option, the others cease to exist. Once, for example, option B is chosen, options A and C have no chance of happening. Option A might have been better, or might have been worse. Likewise option C. With the B policy chosen, these alternatives are no longer alternatives. Which is why contemplating such alternatives was futile in the first place, and making decisions on the basis of such contemplations makes no sense at all. It is not possible, that is, to know rationally what is in the national interest. To rely on rationalism is, therefore, to overplay rationalism, which is to underplay Taoism in turn, and to underplay sacral spontaneity (Graham, 1981, p. 14). 8 This is why Taoists see intellectual detachment in terms of a ‘returning’ to the ‘‘root’ or ‘trunk’ or ‘seed’ . . . [or] ‘gate’ . . . [or] ‘axis’ . . .’ (Graham, 1981, p. 21), and tend not to posit a reality behind appearances, as modernists/rationalists do. Taoist thought is figured against a very different metaphysical ground. As Graham says: ‘In so far as we can co-ordinate the Chinese concepts with our own, it seems that the physical world has more being and reality than the Way. However it is only by grasping the Way that we mirror the physical world clearly . . .’ (Graham, 1981, p. 21). 74 Ralph Pettman Modernist proponents of global security demur. Enough people in the world live as if modernist conceptions of global security ought to prevail, they note, for most of these conceptions to prevail in practice. Enough people behave as if world order is made up of sovereign states, for example, for this way of ordering world affairs to be a tangible, global reality. The same applies to liberal marketeering, global modes of making civil identity, the global formation of capitalist classes, the global advent of social movements, and the global advent of gender-specific practices. There is a self-fulfilling quality to the modernist project, and we must deal with its global consequences, they argue, whether the Taoist critique of the rationalist cause is valid or not. This is not to say that the people of the world live in the best of all possible worlds. Perhaps there is a preferred alternative, though perhaps (and this is the Taoist thought) there is no ‘preferred alternative’ either, at least of a rationally accessible sort. Perhaps it is a matter of standing back to look at this cosmos that we are all in, then standing close to listen, then feeling as best we can for how it moves, before standing back to look once more. Perhaps we might even learn something in taking ourselves through such a process, something we might need to know if we are to understand global security. 4.2 Comparing Taoist concerns with human security ones Speaking of the people of the world, I will now move to consider the concept of global security in terms of human security. The concept of human security still tends to be used to describe everything that the statist/militarist forms of security thinking are not (Paris, 2001). I think this is a mistake since I think it is more useful to see strategic security thinking as one aspect of human security thinking. I shall heed the conventional distinction here, however, as a way of comparing Taoist ideas and non-strategic security ones. The Taoist is likely to turn first to the pre- and post-modernist margins that modernist/rationalists create as they seek to extend their hegemonic grasp. Modernists consign to the margins those not deemed rationalistic enough, like women, and those who do not accept modernity as being necessarily beneficial, like many environmentalists. While feminists highlight the male-made character of global security, most feminists are also modernists, however. As such they are not in much of an epistemological mood to listen to Taoists, who they tend to think of as representing a pre-modernist way of thinking. Environmentalists, meanwhile, highlight the impact modernist humankind is having upon the planet’s ecosystems. The modernists among them tend to dismiss Taoist thinking likewise. The Taoist might turn next to those who speak the different analytic lan- Taoism and the concept of global security 75 guages mapped in the first section of this article with regard to the different assumptions analysts make about human nature and nurturing practices. Since those who speak these languages are all rationalists, however, the Taoist is likely to meet with the epistemological incomprehension already discussed. Perhaps the Taoist should apply a more specific Taoist technique, therefore. Perhaps a more particular expression of the Taoist perspective will be able to gain better purchase on the rationalist position. In this section I shall look at human security in the light of the Taoist preference for wu-wei, that is, active pacifism, or ‘no unnatural action’, or, as Graham calls it, ‘Doing Nothing’ (Graham, 1981, p. 288; 1989, pp. 232–233). To Needham, wu-wei means not using force when ‘subtler methods of persuasion, or simply letting things alone to take their own course’ promises a good outcome (Needham, 1956, pp. 37, 68). To Merton it means ‘perfect action – because . . . carried out . . . in perfect harmony with the whole . . . [and] not “conditioned” or “limited” by our own individual needs . . . desires . . . theories and ideas’ (Merton, 1965, p. 28). To Hansen it means action that avoids ‘artificially induced or learned purposes or desires . . . [since g]etting rid of wei . . . [means] freeing us from society’s purposes, socially induced desires, social distinctions or meaning structures . . .’ (Hansen, 1992, p. 214). Clearly, we are going to encounter here the same translation troubles we did earlier. A general reading of the Taoist literature seems to suggest that the Taoist sees wu-wei as a demonstrably caring, humble, frugal, yielding, and wise way to respond, however. It is the kind of (re)action that spares lives as much as it can, while leaving people as much as possible to themselves. It is the kind of (re)action that deals with large matters while they are still small, and fosters ‘being content’. It is the kind of counsel state-makers heed when they keep their ‘sharpest weapons where none can see them’, and regard all weapons as not ‘lovely’. It opposes conquest by force of arms, knows ‘the male’ and yet cleaves to that which is ‘female’, seeks the welfare of ordinary people, and endeavours to see and hear as ordinary people do. It tries not to stimulate the desire for products that are hard to get, and it tries not to legislate kindness or morality, exalt fame or riches, or rely upon either the ritual or overt use of power. In short, it tries to foster gentle friendships, true words, good government, due regulation, and effective deeds (Lao Tzu, 1997, pp. 11, 29, 31, 32, 37, 49, 75, 77, 81). Despite all the in-built universals (what constitutes wisdom or compassion? what is a true word? what is good government? what is an effective deed?), this concept is not a vague one. If it still seems so, it is given a graphic account in the practise of Taoist-inspired martial arts like that of tai 76 Ralph Pettman chi chuan, or judo, or aikido. In tai chi chuan the force of the opponent is returned or redirected, making it possible to prevail by yielding rather than by retaliating. This has important implications for conflict management and conflict resolution, even though it may well be one thing to redirect a punch to the person, and quite another to topple the global edifice of gender discrimination or capitalist exploitation, or to fight a guerrilla war. In Japanese judo, which is derived from the Chinese martial arts, weaker people learn to overcome stronger ones by moving in ways that do not offer resistance (Creel, 1970, p. 67). The same principle is manifest in aikido, a Taoist-style meditation in martial movement, where the purpose is to bring the self into accord ‘with the universe itself ’. This requires the practitioner to prevail over the ‘mind of discord’ in itself. In practice, this does not mean retreat. Nor does it mean retaliation. It means completing the task we all purportedly have, that is ‘to reconcile the world and make human beings one family’ (Uyeshiba, 1963, pp. 177, 178; Pettman, 1993). Returning to the analytic map of the concept of global security provided at the start, we can now compare the thinking of those who speak as liberal analysts of the inter-state system or society, for example, with their optimistic assumptions about the capacity for tit-for-tat behaviour, and Taoist thinking, which makes no such assumptions, and is not constrained by the rationalist context in which such assumptions are articulated. Wu-wei decrees no need to return tit-for-tat in promoting global security. It may mean practising reciprocity. It may not. There is no conceptual obligation either way, since ‘no unnatural action’ is not a contractual practice. The Tao te ching espouses a sense of the human whole instead. Since the Taoist also eschews legislated forms of morality, he or she is not bound to the kind of agreements that make international alliances and organizations possible. In dealing with global security matters, he or she seeks to employ sacral spontaneity rather than analytic deliberation, artlessness rather than purposefulness, and to engage in action not planned in the more premeditated way. This sounds to rationalist ears like a recipe for disaster, since it appears to lack all the certainty they are used to in securing global affairs. There are no agreed rules, or agreed habits of international practice where rules cannot be established, or established ways of using force where co-operative means fail. They are likely to point to the Hitlers of this world, who revel in Taoist-style spontaneity, and who take millions of innocent people down with them. And they are right to do so. Taoists are not racist fascists, however. This kind of spontaneity is not Taoist, even when it gets couched in sacral terms. The key Taoist works read nothing like the ideological writings of a Hitler or one of his ilk. Indeed, they speak from a perspective that shows these writings to be human Taoism and the concept of global security 77 atavisms. They repudiate them comprehensively. Moreover, Hitler was the product of rationalism gone awry. Reaching for the mind-view that made for his rise in the first place is not what we necessarily want to do next. If we turn to the rationalist proponents of world government, we find those who are more optimistic than the liberals about the possibility of global governance, and we find that Taoists do not make this kind of assumption either. Nor do they accept the conceptual constraints involved. Taoists do not see people as being calculating or altruistic. In practise ‘no unnatural action’ makes for a mirror-like appraisal of the moment. It may mean promoting world governance or government. It may not. Given the sacral spontaneity that wu-wei represents, any policy choice may be preferred (Graham, 1981, p. 91). It will depend on what lets most people live out their lives relatively unharassed. In terms of the politico-economic (market-making) dimension to world affairs, the practice of wu-wei may or may not stand in stark contrast to the dog-eat-dog thinking of contemporary economic protectionists, the tit-for-tat thinking of global marketeers, and the hail-fellow-well-met thinking of international socialists. While protectionists always see a need to defend their country against the predatory behaviour of trading and investing ‘others’, Taoists may or may not feel obliged to respond with economic nationalism of this sort. Likewise with the free trading and investing practices that those who see human beings as basically calculating espouse (though the Tao te ching does eschew the stimulation of a desire for products that are hard to get). Nor do Taoists necessarily espouse the planned production and distribution policies that altruistic socialists find most congenial either (though the Tao te ching does recommend distributing a country’s wealth evenly, without legislating kindness). If we focus upon issues to do with global economic development and human want, we can see that Taoists are not constrained to the rationalist languages currently used here to do their thinking with. The concept of wu-wei frees us from the constraints these languages impose. This does not mean that wu-wei prescribes set developmental policies of some other kind, or has a solution it can bring to bear upon a specific famine (though Taoism does enjoin us to be frugal and content, foster the welfare of ordinary people, and not exalt riches). It does mean that wu-wei will always see economic well-being as part of the security equation, however, which is still not an acknowledged part of the rationalist approach to global security. It will always argue that people should not want, as well, which is not yet the basic position in the rationalist world either. In terms of the politico-social dimension to world affairs, we can see how the practice of wu-wei may or may not entail the dog-eat-dog thinking of 78 Ralph Pettman contemporary nationalists, the tit-for-tat thinking of modernist proponents of human rights and democracy, or the hail-fellow-well-met thinking of modernist proponents of social movements. Taoism is not constrained to any particular policy or policies. Indeed, it enjoins us not to get caught up in the conventional thinking that these rationalist ways of talking about the self-in-world-society represent. This does not make it a panacea (though the humane and caring character of Taoism would make it the basis for one, as would its sense of cosmic respect). It does invite us to move beyond the rationalist way of thinking, though, to entertain the Taoist level of experience, before deciding what to do. Which brings us to that part of the analytic map sketched at the beginning that accounts for those who emphasize the importance of human nurturing practices, not human nature. Classical marxists emphasize the materialist nature of the nurturing environment, articulating an analytic language that describes and explains the concept of global security in terms of the capitalist mode of production, capitalist exploitation, and the relevant class struggle. Neo-marxists add a mentalist note to this story to account for the hegemonic power of the ruling class, and its capacity to craft a concept of global security that serves its particular interests. Taoist spontaneity is radically different in that it does not portend any particular alternative to the analytic certainties (neo)marxist doctrines represent. Nor does it preclude the policies they prescribe or proscribe. Wu-wei practice seeks responses that are more immediate, instead, and more appropriate to the global security situation, as read as a whole, and from one moment to the next. It seeks a sense of the whole security situation, before affirming that sense in such a way as to nurture as many concerned as possible. Of the analytic languages that articulate preconceptions about human nurturing practices, constructivism is the one most like Taoism. This analytic language highlights the mentalist aspect of the nurturing environment. It does not recommend any particular policy response, since it merely highlights the mentally-made component to them all. Taoism can look very similar, particularly when we find the Tao te ching recommending that we should think as ordinary people think, which is just what the so-called ‘commonsense’ version of constructivism does (Pettman, 2000). While constructivism does not prescribe a particular way of thinking about the concept of global security, it is still rationalist, however, and it still constrains us to a mentalist rather than a materialist consideration of the concept. Taoism does not. It is non-rationalist and sacralist. And while most rationalists are likely to find this a recipe for epistemological anarchy, some may find that it is an opportunity to explore and assess productive ways of thinking that rationalism precludes. Taoism and the concept of global security 79 4.3 Comparing Taoist concerns with conventional strategic ones The dominant (though not necessarily the most important) language spoken about contemporary world affairs is the (neo)realist one. It articulates all of our dog-eat-dog notions about an anarchic world system, and global and regional balances of power. Compare the concept of wu-wei. This would seem to have nothing to do with the whole politico-strategic spectrum (Pettman, 1998, p. 176). On the one hand we have the classical realist dialect of alliance-hopping, and the neo-realist dialect of structural reasons for self-help. We have prescriptions for the pursuit of the national self-interest, and for the proscription of intervention in other states’ affairs. We have state-centricity, and pessimistic assumptions about human nature. On the other hand we have the Taoist determination to make no such assumptions and accept no such constraints. We have clear but not dogmatic opposition to conquest by force of arms. We have the decision to be as flexible as possible about what foreign policies to adopt, and how to implement them. We have the determination to act or react with profound, indeed sacral spontaneity. Rationalists aptly point out that anything less than sacral spontaneity is likely to fall flat on its face. While we wrestle with whether we are profound enough, however, we can always, as the Tao te ching recommends, keep the state’s biggest guns out of sight, treat them as unattractive (no parades or fly-pasts), use overt force extremely reluctantly, ensure that collateral human damage is kept to an absolute minimum if we do have to use force, and treat any success as a tragedy not a triumph. The ultimate issue in the politico-strategic realm is war. How does wu-wei apply here? Human warring is regularly analysed rationally in terms of a range of causes, kinds and consequences. The results of these analyses are used to plan appropriate politico-strategic practices, whether of an offensive, defensive, or pre-emptive kind. Human warring can also be analysed by meditating, however – that is, by not cogitating so self-consciously upon the ways in which we relate to each other and the world. The results of these meditations can then be used to practice neither offence, defence, or preemption, but a kind of watchfulness, a kind of non-anticipation, a way of being in the world-moment that is equaniminous, open, and aware. The latter is the one that wu-wei exemplifies. It would be worthy but fruitless to try and deal with world conflict by getting state-makers to meditate. Meditative disciplines are arduous, their results are uncertain, and modernist state-makers are particularly susceptible to practising the ‘un-Chinese habit of puzzling about ultimate reality . . . independent of sense perception and reason’ (Graham, 1989, p. 234). It might not be foolish to heed the advice provided by Taoists as a result 80 Ralph Pettman of their meditations, however. This is not advice about how to gain privileged access to an external reality. It is about the particular kinds of conclusions that become available when Taoists relinquish their mental grasp of ‘categories made habitual by naming’ (Graham, 1989, pp. 234–235), and seek meditative clarity for themselves (Needham, 1956, p. 33). If this sounds too general and self-serving, we might also recall that the Taoist classics conclude that war is never a preferred activity, and that when there is an alternative, we should take it. As the Tao te ching concludes: ‘Show me a man of violence that came to a good end, and I will take him for my teacher’ (Lao Tzu, 1997, pp. 31, 32, 45, 72, 77). In articulating their meditations, do Taoists contradict themselves? Creel thinks so, drawing attention to the difficulty of being both purposive and contemplative (meditative) at the same time (Creel, 1970, p. 45). Ames, on the other hand, repudiates attempts like Creel’s to cast Taoism in terms of a purposive/contemplative dichotomy, or in terms of any other reading that imputes to Taoism a (political) purpose: Since Taoist political theory is propounded as a microcosm of . . . [its] metaphysics in which the operation of the political state is seen as correlative to the functioning of the cosmos, it follows that the ideal ruler can only be ‘purposive’ if in fact there is some purpose in his cosmic counterpart, the tao. [And while t]he Taoism of the Lao Tzu does acknowledge a certain natural ‘so-ness’ which exists in all things and propels them toward their own realization . . . the political theory of the Lao Tzu is certainly not purposive in the sense of advocating a specific and artificially contrived political program which enables one to seize and exercise political control . . . (Ames, 1994, p. 218, fn. 23) Are Taoists also being impractical? The authors of the Huai Nan Tze (206 B.C.E.–8 C.E.) thought so, castigating Taoists for being naïve and primitive, and for seeming to provide a ‘total repudiation of human culture’ (Ames, 1994, p. 219, fn. 34). Why should an active form of pacifism be better than any other policy, they said? Why should a deliberate attempt to craft the world to human advantage be any less likely to accord with the way the universe works than a policy of active pacifism? It is at this point that Taoists are most likely to be misunderstood. When Taoists tell state-makers to be more actively pacifist, for example, they seem to be advising them to intervene less. This is not necessarily so, however. A Taoist does not necessarily advise either retreat or quiescence. A Taoist response might be more interventionist, or it might be less interventionist. The Taoist will decide from one moment to the next what is most appropriate. If he or she does advise intervention, then he or she is not likely to Taoism and the concept of global security 81 advise that this be done in a single-minded way. All of which might be scant comfort for the harassed policy adviser, though it might be a welcome breather for the policy-maker him- or herself. It might even be a moment he or she wants to prolong. 5 Conclusion The concept of global security is articulated today in terms of many different issue-areas. The more conventional of these issue-areas are those that involve the global military balance, though even these have less conventional components to them, like the issues raised by contemporary terrorism, or contemporary piracy. The less conventional issue-areas involve those like the global balance of productivity, which is now recognized as an important part of the concept of global security (hence the significance now afforded such issues as labour migration), and the global balance of identities (hence the importance now placed on the security issues that diasporas, refugees, and migrant populations represent). To talk about any of these issue-areas is to talk in one or more of the modernist analytical languages mapped at the beginning of this article. Indeed, it is not possible to describe or explain any global security issue-area without using an analytical language of some kind. These analytical languages are part of the modernist/rationalist project, a globalizing initiative that makes, in turn, for the kind of margins manifest in environmental concerns, or in the gender concerns that the global statistics to do with women’s well-being represent. Although the modernist/rationalist project is currently hegemonic, it encounters other thought-worlds that do not work on the same assumptions. These thought-worlds include Taoism, which is the thought-world discussed here. The epistemological divide between rationalism and Taoism is a radical one. It can be bridged, but not from the rationalist side. Once it is bridged we can bring across a range of Taoist concepts to compare with rationalist ones, including the Taoist concept of wu-wei. These concepts can then be used to understand global security better, in both its developmental (‘human’) and militarist (‘strategic’) forms. Taoists do not ‘see’ the concept of global security as being about ‘order’, ‘well-being’, or even ‘truth’. They do not ‘see’ the concept of global security in the way modernists/rationalists see this concept. This can be somewhat frustrating for those who want explicit policy alternatives to appraise, since Taoism does not provide fixed policy alternatives. What Taoism does do is transgress the limits rationalist thinking sets, however, and compensates for the distortions it creates. The rationalist will insist on scrutinizing what the 82 Ralph Pettman Taoist says, but his or her scrutiny will still be compromised by his or her own preconceptions. This is why we need to keep on recasting the rationalist concept of global security in a sacral context like the Taoist one.
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Specific comparisons of Taoist and non-Taoist approaches to global security Having briefly tried to define Taoism and the Tao, and having indicated some of the problems that arise in trying to doing so, I shall now move to the nub of the matter, which is to compare Taoism and rationalism in epistemological terms. I will then compare Taoist thinking with more rationalist thinking about global security in ‘human’ terms, and then with rationalist thinking about global security in more conventional terms. 4.1 Comparing Taoist and rationalist epistemologies The profundity of the concept of the Tao seems to preclude us from using Taoism to describe its meaning in logical, empirical, analytical terms. As a consequence we are typically invited to talk in analogical and metaphorical terms instead. But this is to jeopardize at once the sympathy of most contemporary social scientists, who as a group are likely to require something much more publicly verifiable before considering it reliable. Rationalists are not about to content themselves with accounts of an aptitude for living 6 The story is that of the drunk who returns home at night and loses his key while trying to open the front door to his home. He is subsequently found by a neighbour looking under a lamplight some distance away. After asking what the drunk is doing, and where he lost his key, the neighbour then asks why the drunk is not looking outside his front door. The drunk replies to the effect that the light is brighter under the lamp. Taoism and the concept of global security 71 expressed in ‘stories, verses, maxims’ and the like (Graham, 1989, pp. 199– 200; Giles, 1961 [1889]) If historically or philosophically minded, they will want to be more systematic. If positivists, they will want to use the hypothetico-deductive method. So let us be clear. Rationalism, which is the doctrine within which most thinking and practice about the concept of global security is currently done, prioritizes reason as an end in itself. Taoism, which is the doctrine I am trying to bring to bear upon the rationalist construction of this concept, is a way of thinking and practice that does not. It prioritizes sacral (and in this instance, Taoist) insights instead. These two are seemingly incommensurable. They would seem to represent an unbridgeable epistemological divide. Their protagonists not only talk different analytical languages, they talk past each other as well, which is just what I want to prevent, not just because I do not like dialogues of the deaf, but more importantly, because I think it is to capitulate to rationalism. From the rationalist perspective, Taoism looks anti-rational. As such, it is at best interesting. It is not reliable knowledge. From the Taoist perspective, however, rationalism is what one does with the rational part of one’s mind. It is only part of what Taoists do, nor need it be the larger part, since it includes the injunction to live in a state of sacral spontaneity. I noted above that rationalism is compromised at its root by the kind of self that is required if rationalism is to succeed. I argued that the individuated self – at one mind’s remove from the community – is objectifying. This self is created in turn by learning to be mentally distanced from the communalist context into which ‘one’ was born. Rationalism valorizes this individuated self, typically turning it into a primary normative purpose. Because this bias is built into rationalism itself, and because it limits and distorts so thoroughly what rationalism can do, we have to go outside rationalism to compensate for it. Otherwise, whenever we use rationalism, we will get the world right, but we will also get the world wrong. The most straightforward compensation procedure I know is one that enjoins us to get close to listen, and to take part, that is, to actively eschew the objectifying mind-gaze to participate in what one wants to understand. Anthropologists do this when they immerse themselves in a society not their own. The compensation bid need not stop there, however. It can be carried over from the social ground to the sacral one (and in this case the Taoist one), thus providing the kind of insight not otherwise available to rationalists because of how they choose to know. Those rationalists who get this far will no doubt want to follow their Taoist insights up by considering them rationally, but at least they will have Taoist insights to follow up. At least, having accepted immersion in the ‘shal- 72 Ralph Pettman low’ or meditative end of the experiential pool,7 or even beyond, they may have learned what otherwise they would not have been able to. The rationalist may even want to follow this up with further attempts to take part, and further rationalist reappraisals. By which point we will have constructed a cycle of knowing that is already rolling rationalism forward across the epistemological divide. We are still faced with fundamental uncertainty about the ground on which we stand (though most natural scientists will remain oblivious, and many social scientists likewise.) By eternally returning to both rationalism and Taoism, however, we no longer have to set the one up in opposition to the other. We do not have to abandon our regard for rigour, or our preference for specified indices of comparison, or for reassessing sacral insights in non-sacral ways. But nor do we have to abandon the idea that Taoism has something meaningful to say about the concept of global security. The two are no longer placed in contention, since to place them thus is to cleave to the rationalist line as the surest way to know what is true, and to ignore the way the ontological character of rationalism compromises any such surety. While we are used to having sacral illusion dispelled by analytic clarity, we are not so used to having analytic illusion dispelled by sacral clarity. That is the task before us, however, and it is a task with normative implications considerably more extensive than those rationalists would valorize. How does moving onto Taoist ground, and immersing ourselves in Taoist experience, play out in practice? Our section on mapping the concept of global security began by highlighting the making of modernity. If we start with this general project, and cast it in the light of the general Taoist knack for sacral spontaneity, we see at once how little this knack has to do with the rationalist way of thinking or being. Where the modernist/rationalist talks of empirical logic and scientific representation, the sacralist/Taoist talks (in Graham’s terms, at least) of the rejection of empirical logic, and an ‘infinite regress, testing by tests which in the end are themselves untested’ (Graham, 7 Arriving at Taoist precepts requires the use of what Waley calls ‘quietism’, or the ‘gradual inward-turning of . . . thought’ (Waley, 1934, pp. 43, 45). This involves the use of the mind in non-rationalist, indeed anti-rationalist ways, that allow it to become less distracted and more aware. For rationalists, meditation as a research methodology is too subjective. Why should we accept the results of Taoist quietism, they say, as a way to plan global security, for example, when we can use rationalist bargaining strategies and mediation practices instead? Why, for that matter, should we treat exploitation or global destitution or environmental neglect with meditative detachment, rather than with objective plans for changing the world for the better? Why should we use non-rational illumination to help rulers order the inter-state system when we have publically replicable ways of thinking that allow us to do so scientifically (Graham, 1989, p. 234)? Taoists respond by comparing their accounts of the world with modernist ones. They point out how modernist state-makers are taught to understand world affairs by objectifying. They point out how knowing of this sort is circumscribed by the nature of the primary experience that makes untrammelled reasoning possible (individuation). And they see themselves as eschewing these limits by inviting a different kind of primary experience. Taoism and the concept of global security 73 1981, pp. 10, 11). Where the rationalist talks of the hypothetico-deductive method, the Taoist talks (again in Graham’s terms) of an understanding of the ‘mysterious order which runs through all things’, and the universal motion of chi energy (Graham, 1981, pp. 12, 19–20). Where the rationalist talks of a detached and individuated intellectual vantage-point, separate from society, where reason can be given free reign to cogitate and communicate, the Taoist talks (in Hansen’s terms this time) of ‘heart-minds’ (Hansen, 1992, pp. 53, 85–86). Taoists respond to the situation they are in by unfocusing, that is, by allowing themselves to act with the ‘immediacy of an echo’, rather than the self-consciousness of someone who applies general principles. (Graham, 1981, pp. 6, 12, 14). They invite, in other words, the kind of recognition the ‘heart’ gives ‘when the mind is silent’ (Krishnamurti, 1972, p. 34). This is metaphorical language, but we are not, after all, trying to ascertain what is scientifically true. We are trying to locate scientific truth-finding within its sacral context.8 Faced with global security planning, Taoists highlight the way rationalist attempts to anticipate a particular foreign policy can only reach so far. Taoists highlight how those who really know what they are doing tend to eschew conscious thought to attend instead to the ‘total situation’. This ‘knack’, like a feel for the way a bacterium works, or for how to play a musical instrument, is not one that can be ultimately explained (Graham, 1983, p. 7). Taoists also compare the way they face the future with the way it is faced by those who promote the national interest, for example, or the relevant capitalist/corporate, politico-social, bourgeois, or masculinist interest. The rationalist entertains options A, B, and C, and plays out each one in advance, in a bid to anticipate what will turn out the best. Except that it is not possible to anticipate what will turn out the best. In choosing one policy option, the others cease to exist. Once, for example, option B is chosen, options A and C have no chance of happening. Option A might have been better, or might have been worse. Likewise option C. With the B policy chosen, these alternatives are no longer alternatives. Which is why contemplating such alternatives was futile in the first place, and making decisions on the basis of such contemplations makes no sense at all. It is not possible, that is, to know rationally what is in the national interest. To rely on rationalism is, therefore, to overplay rationalism, which is to underplay Taoism in turn, and to underplay sacral spontaneity (Graham, 1981, p. 14). 8 This is why Taoists see intellectual detachment in terms of a ‘returning’ to the ‘‘root’ or ‘trunk’ or ‘seed’ . . . [or] ‘gate’ . . . [or] ‘axis’ . . .’ (Graham, 1981, p. 21), and tend not to posit a reality behind appearances, as modernists/rationalists do. Taoist thought is figured against a very different metaphysical ground. As Graham says: ‘In so far as we can co-ordinate the Chinese concepts with our own, it seems that the physical world has more being and reality than the Way. However it is only by grasping the Way that we mirror the physical world clearly . . .’ (Graham, 1981, p. 21). 74 Ralph Pettman Modernist proponents of global security demur. Enough people in the world live as if modernist conceptions of global security ought to prevail, they note, for most of these conceptions to prevail in practice. Enough people behave as if world order is made up of sovereign states, for example, for this way of ordering world affairs to be a tangible, global reality. The same applies to liberal marketeering, global modes of making civil identity, the global formation of capitalist classes, the global advent of social movements, and the global advent of gender-specific practices. There is a self-fulfilling quality to the modernist project, and we must deal with its global consequences, they argue, whether the Taoist critique of the rationalist cause is valid or not. This is not to say that the people of the world live in the best of all possible worlds. Perhaps there is a preferred alternative, though perhaps (and this is the Taoist thought) there is no ‘preferred alternative’ either, at least of a rationally accessible sort. Perhaps it is a matter of standing back to look at this cosmos that we are all in, then standing close to listen, then feeling as best we can for how it moves, before standing back to look once more. Perhaps we might even learn something in taking ourselves through such a process, something we might need to know if we are to understand global security. 4.2 Comparing Taoist concerns with human security ones Speaking of the people of the world, I will now move to consider the concept of global security in terms of human security. The concept of human security still tends to be used to describe everything that the statist/militarist forms of security thinking are not (Paris, 2001). I think this is a mistake since I think it is more useful to see strategic security thinking as one aspect of human security thinking. I shall heed the conventional distinction here, however, as a way of comparing Taoist ideas and non-strategic security ones. The Taoist is likely to turn first to the pre- and post-modernist margins that modernist/rationalists create as they seek to extend their hegemonic grasp. Modernists consign to the margins those not deemed rationalistic enough, like women, and those who do not accept modernity as being necessarily beneficial, like many environmentalists. While feminists highlight the male-made character of global security, most feminists are also modernists, however. As such they are not in much of an epistemological mood to listen to Taoists, who they tend to think of as representing a pre-modernist way of thinking. Environmentalists, meanwhile, highlight the impact modernist humankind is having upon the planet’s ecosystems. The modernists among them tend to dismiss Taoist thinking likewise. The Taoist might turn next to those who speak the different analytic lan- Taoism and the concept of global security 75 guages mapped in the first section of this article with regard to the different assumptions analysts make about human nature and nurturing practices. Since those who speak these languages are all rationalists, however, the Taoist is likely to meet with the epistemological incomprehension already discussed. Perhaps the Taoist should apply a more specific Taoist technique, therefore. Perhaps a more particular expression of the Taoist perspective will be able to gain better purchase on the rationalist position. In this section I shall look at human security in the light of the Taoist preference for wu-wei, that is, active pacifism, or ‘no unnatural action’, or, as Graham calls it, ‘Doing Nothing’ (Graham, 1981, p. 288; 1989, pp. 232–233). To Needham, wu-wei means not using force when ‘subtler methods of persuasion, or simply letting things alone to take their own course’ promises a good outcome (Needham, 1956, pp. 37, 68). To Merton it means ‘perfect action – because . . . carried out . . . in perfect harmony with the whole . . . [and] not “conditioned” or “limited” by our own individual needs . . . desires . . . theories and ideas’ (Merton, 1965, p. 28). To Hansen it means action that avoids ‘artificially induced or learned purposes or desires . . . [since g]etting rid of wei . . . [means] freeing us from society’s purposes, socially induced desires, social distinctions or meaning structures . . .’ (Hansen, 1992, p. 214). Clearly, we are going to encounter here the same translation troubles we did earlier. A general reading of the Taoist literature seems to suggest that the Taoist sees wu-wei as a demonstrably caring, humble, frugal, yielding, and wise way to respond, however. It is the kind of (re)action that spares lives as much as it can, while leaving people as much as possible to themselves. It is the kind of (re)action that deals with large matters while they are still small, and fosters ‘being content’. It is the kind of counsel state-makers heed when they keep their ‘sharpest weapons where none can see them’, and regard all weapons as not ‘lovely’. It opposes conquest by force of arms, knows ‘the male’ and yet cleaves to that which is ‘female’, seeks the welfare of ordinary people, and endeavours to see and hear as ordinary people do. It tries not to stimulate the desire for products that are hard to get, and it tries not to legislate kindness or morality, exalt fame or riches, or rely upon either the ritual or overt use of power. In short, it tries to foster gentle friendships, true words, good government, due regulation, and effective deeds (Lao Tzu, 1997, pp. 11, 29, 31, 32, 37, 49, 75, 77, 81). Despite all the in-built universals (what constitutes wisdom or compassion? what is a true word? what is good government? what is an effective deed?), this concept is not a vague one. If it still seems so, it is given a graphic account in the practise of Taoist-inspired martial arts like that of tai 76 Ralph Pettman chi chuan, or judo, or aikido. In tai chi chuan the force of the opponent is returned or redirected, making it possible to prevail by yielding rather than by retaliating. This has important implications for conflict management and conflict resolution, even though it may well be one thing to redirect a punch to the person, and quite another to topple the global edifice of gender discrimination or capitalist exploitation, or to fight a guerrilla war. In Japanese judo, which is derived from the Chinese martial arts, weaker people learn to overcome stronger ones by moving in ways that do not offer resistance (Creel, 1970, p. 67). The same principle is manifest in aikido, a Taoist-style meditation in martial movement, where the purpose is to bring the self into accord ‘with the universe itself ’. This requires the practitioner to prevail over the ‘mind of discord’ in itself. In practice, this does not mean retreat. Nor does it mean retaliation. It means completing the task we all purportedly have, that is ‘to reconcile the world and make human beings one family’ (Uyeshiba, 1963, pp. 177, 178; Pettman, 1993). Returning to the analytic map of the concept of global security provided at the start, we can now compare the thinking of those who speak as liberal analysts of the inter-state system or society, for example, with their optimistic assumptions about the capacity for tit-for-tat behaviour, and Taoist thinking, which makes no such assumptions, and is not constrained by the rationalist context in which such assumptions are articulated. Wu-wei decrees no need to return tit-for-tat in promoting global security. It may mean practising reciprocity. It may not. There is no conceptual obligation either way, since ‘no unnatural action’ is not a contractual practice. The Tao te ching espouses a sense of the human whole instead. Since the Taoist also eschews legislated forms of morality, [they are] not bound to the kind of agreements that make international alliances and organizations possible. In dealing with global security matters, [they seek] to employ sacral spontaneity rather than analytic deliberation, artlessness rather than purposefulness, and to engage in action not planned in the more premeditated way. This sounds to rationalist ears like a recipe for disaster, since it appears to lack all the certainty they are used to in securing global affairs. There are no agreed rules, or agreed habits of international practice where rules cannot be established, or established ways of using force where co-operative means fail. They are likely to point to the Hitlers of this world, who revel in Taoist-style spontaneity, and who take millions of innocent people down with them. And they are right to do so. Taoists are not racist fascists, however. This kind of spontaneity is not Taoist, even when it gets couched in sacral terms. The key Taoist works read nothing like the ideological writings of a Hitler or one of his ilk. Indeed, they speak from a perspective that shows these writings to be human Taoism and the concept of global security 77 atavisms. They repudiate them comprehensively. Moreover, Hitler was the product of rationalism gone awry. Reaching for the mind-view that made for his rise in the first place is not what we necessarily want to do next. If we turn to the rationalist proponents of world government, we find those who are more optimistic than the liberals about the possibility of global governance, and we find that Taoists do not make this kind of assumption either. Nor do they accept the conceptual constraints involved. Taoists do not see people as being calculating or altruistic. In practise ‘no unnatural action’ makes for a mirror-like appraisal of the moment. It may mean promoting world governance or government. It may not. Given the sacral spontaneity that wu-wei represents, any policy choice may be preferred (Graham, 1981, p. 91). It will depend on what lets most people live out their lives relatively unharassed. In terms of the politico-economic (market-making) dimension to world affairs, the practice of wu-wei may or may not stand in stark contrast to the dog-eat-dog thinking of contemporary economic protectionists, the tit-for-tat thinking of global marketeers, and the hail-fellow-well-met thinking of international socialists. While protectionists always see a need to defend their country against the predatory behaviour of trading and investing ‘others’, Taoists may or may not feel obliged to respond with economic nationalism of this sort. Likewise with the free trading and investing practices that those who see human beings as basically calculating espouse (though the Tao te ching does eschew the stimulation of a desire for products that are hard to get). Nor do Taoists necessarily espouse the planned production and distribution policies that altruistic socialists find most congenial either (though the Tao te ching does recommend distributing a country’s wealth evenly, without legislating kindness). If we focus upon issues to do with global economic development and human want, we can see that Taoists are not constrained to the rationalist languages currently used here to do their thinking with. The concept of wu-wei frees us from the constraints these languages impose. This does not mean that wu-wei prescribes set developmental policies of some other kind, or has a solution it can bring to bear upon a specific famine (though Taoism does enjoin us to be frugal and content, foster the welfare of ordinary people, and not exalt riches). It does mean that wu-wei will always see economic well-being as part of the security equation, however, which is still not an acknowledged part of the rationalist approach to global security. It will always argue that people should not want, as well, which is not yet the basic position in the rationalist world either. In terms of the politico-social dimension to world affairs, we can see how the practice of wu-wei may or may not entail the dog-eat-dog thinking of 78 Ralph Pettman contemporary nationalists, the tit-for-tat thinking of modernist proponents of human rights and democracy, or the hail-fellow-well-met thinking of modernist proponents of social movements. Taoism is not constrained to any particular policy or policies. Indeed, it enjoins us not to get caught up in the conventional thinking that these rationalist ways of talking about the self-in-world-society represent. This does not make it a panacea (though the humane and caring character of Taoism would make it the basis for one, as would its sense of cosmic respect). It does invite us to move beyond the rationalist way of thinking, though, to entertain the Taoist level of experience, before deciding what to do. Which brings us to that part of the analytic map sketched at the beginning that accounts for those who emphasize the importance of human nurturing practices, not human nature. Classical marxists emphasize the materialist nature of the nurturing environment, articulating an analytic language that describes and explains the concept of global security in terms of the capitalist mode of production, capitalist exploitation, and the relevant class struggle. Neo-marxists add a mentalist note to this story to account for the hegemonic power of the ruling class, and its capacity to craft a concept of global security that serves its particular interests. Taoist spontaneity is radically different in that it does not portend any particular alternative to the analytic certainties (neo)marxist doctrines represent. Nor does it preclude the policies they prescribe or proscribe. Wu-wei practice seeks responses that are more immediate, instead, and more appropriate to the global security situation, as read as a whole, and from one moment to the next. It seeks a sense of the whole security situation, before affirming that sense in such a way as to nurture as many concerned as possible. Of the analytic languages that articulate preconceptions about human nurturing practices, constructivism is the one most like Taoism. This analytic language highlights the mentalist aspect of the nurturing environment. It does not recommend any particular policy response, since it merely highlights the mentally-made component to them all. Taoism can look very similar, particularly when we find the Tao te ching recommending that we should think as ordinary people think, which is just what the so-called ‘commonsense’ version of constructivism does (Pettman, 2000). While constructivism does not prescribe a particular way of thinking about the concept of global security, it is still rationalist, however, and it still constrains us to a mentalist rather than a materialist consideration of the concept. Taoism does not. It is non-rationalist and sacralist. And while most rationalists are likely to find this a recipe for epistemological anarchy, some may find that it is an opportunity to explore and assess productive ways of thinking that rationalism precludes. Taoism and the concept of global security 79 4.3 Comparing Taoist concerns with conventional strategic ones The dominant (though not necessarily the most important) language spoken about contemporary world affairs is the (neo)realist one. It articulates all of our dog-eat-dog notions about an anarchic world system, and global and regional balances of power. Compare the concept of wu-wei. This would seem to have nothing to do with the whole politico-strategic spectrum (Pettman, 1998, p. 176). On the one hand we have the classical realist dialect of alliance-hopping, and the neo-realist dialect of structural reasons for self-help. We have prescriptions for the pursuit of the national self-interest, and for the proscription of intervention in other states’ affairs. We have state-centricity, and pessimistic assumptions about human nature. On the other hand we have the Taoist determination to make no such assumptions and accept no such constraints. We have clear but not dogmatic opposition to conquest by force of arms. We have the decision to be as flexible as possible about what foreign policies to adopt, and how to implement them. We have the determination to act or react with profound, indeed sacral spontaneity. Rationalists aptly point out that anything less than sacral spontaneity is likely to fall flat on its face. While we wrestle with whether we are profound enough, however, we can always, as the Tao te ching recommends, keep the state’s biggest guns out of sight, treat them as unattractive (no parades or fly-pasts), use overt force extremely reluctantly, ensure that collateral human damage is kept to an absolute minimum if we do have to use force, and treat any success as a tragedy not a triumph. The ultimate issue in the politico-strategic realm is war. How does wu-wei apply here? Human warring is regularly analysed rationally in terms of a range of causes, kinds and consequences. The results of these analyses are used to plan appropriate politico-strategic practices, whether of an offensive, defensive, or pre-emptive kind. Human warring can also be analysed by meditating, however – that is, by not cogitating so self-consciously upon the ways in which we relate to each other and the world. The results of these meditations can then be used to practice neither offence, defence, or preemption, but a kind of watchfulness, a kind of non-anticipation, a way of being in the world-moment that is equaniminous, open, and aware. The latter is the one that wu-wei exemplifies. It would be worthy but fruitless to try and deal with world conflict by getting state-makers to meditate. Meditative disciplines are arduous, their results are uncertain, and modernist state-makers are particularly susceptible to practising the ‘un-Chinese habit of puzzling about ultimate reality . . . independent of sense perception and reason’ (Graham, 1989, p. 234). It might not be foolish to heed the advice provided by Taoists as a result 80 Ralph Pettman of their meditations, however. This is not advice about how to gain privileged access to an external reality. It is about the particular kinds of conclusions that become available when Taoists relinquish their mental grasp of ‘categories made habitual by naming’ (Graham, 1989, pp. 234–235), and seek meditative clarity for themselves (Needham, 1956, p. 33). If this sounds too general and self-serving, we might also recall that the Taoist classics conclude that war is never a preferred activity, and that when there is an alternative, we should take it. As the Tao te ching concludes: ‘Show me a man of violence that came to a good end, and I will take him for my teacher’ (Lao Tzu, 1997, pp. 31, 32, 45, 72, 77). In articulating their meditations, do Taoists contradict themselves? Creel thinks so, drawing attention to the difficulty of being both purposive and contemplative (meditative) at the same time (Creel, 1970, p. 45). Ames, on the other hand, repudiates attempts like Creel’s to cast Taoism in terms of a purposive/contemplative dichotomy, or in terms of any other reading that imputes to Taoism a (political) purpose: Since Taoist political theory is propounded as a microcosm of . . . [its] metaphysics in which the operation of the political state is seen as correlative to the functioning of the cosmos, it follows that the ideal ruler can only be ‘purposive’ if in fact there is some purpose in his cosmic counterpart, the tao. [And while t]he Taoism of the Lao Tzu does acknowledge a certain natural ‘so-ness’ which exists in all things and propels them toward their own realization . . . the political theory of the Lao Tzu is certainly not purposive in the sense of advocating a specific and artificially contrived political program which enables one to seize and exercise political control . . . (Ames, 1994, p. 218, fn. 23) Are Taoists also being impractical? The authors of the Huai Nan Tze (206 B.C.E.–8 C.E.) thought so, castigating Taoists for being naïve and primitive, and for seeming to provide a ‘total repudiation of human culture’ (Ames, 1994, p. 219, fn. 34). Why should an active form of pacifism be better than any other policy, they said? Why should a deliberate attempt to craft the world to human advantage be any less likely to accord with the way the universe works than a policy of active pacifism? It is at this point that Taoists are most likely to be misunderstood. When Taoists tell state-makers to be more actively pacifist, for example, they seem to be advising them to intervene less. This is not necessarily so, however. A Taoist does not necessarily advise either retreat or quiescence. A Taoist response might be more interventionist, or it might be less interventionist. The Taoist will decide from one moment to the next what is most appropriate. If he or she does advise intervention, then he or she is not likely to Taoism and the concept of global security 81 advise that this be done in a single-minded way. All of which might be scant comfort for the harassed policy adviser, though it might be a welcome breather for the policy-maker him- or herself. It might even be a moment he or she wants to prolong. 5 Conclusion The concept of global security is articulated today in terms of many different issue-areas. The more conventional of these issue-areas are those that involve the global military balance, though even these have less conventional components to them, like the issues raised by contemporary terrorism, or contemporary piracy. The less conventional issue-areas involve those like the global balance of productivity, which is now recognized as an important part of the concept of global security (hence the significance now afforded such issues as labour migration), and the global balance of identities (hence the importance now placed on the security issues that diasporas, refugees, and migrant populations represent). To talk about any of these issue-areas is to talk in one or more of the modernist analytical languages mapped at the beginning of this article. Indeed, it is not possible to describe or explain any global security issue-area without using an analytical language of some kind. These analytical languages are part of the modernist/rationalist project, a globalizing initiative that makes, in turn, for the kind of margins manifest in environmental concerns, or in the gender concerns that the global statistics to do with women’s well-being represent. Although the modernist/rationalist project is currently hegemonic, it encounters other thought-worlds that do not work on the same assumptions. These thought-worlds include Taoism, which is the thought-world discussed here. The epistemological divide between rationalism and Taoism is a radical one. It can be bridged, but not from the rationalist side. Once it is bridged we can bring across a range of Taoist concepts to compare with rationalist ones, including the Taoist concept of wu-wei. These concepts can then be used to understand global security better, in both its developmental (‘human’) and militarist (‘strategic’) forms. Taoists do not ‘see’ the concept of global security as being about ‘order’, ‘well-being’, or even ‘truth’. They do not ‘see’ the concept of global security in the way modernists/rationalists see this concept. This can be somewhat frustrating for those who want explicit policy alternatives to appraise, since Taoism does not provide fixed policy alternatives. What Taoism does do is transgress the limits rationalist thinking sets, however, and compensates for the distortions it creates. The rationalist will insist on scrutinizing what the 82 Ralph Pettman Taoist says, but his or her scrutiny will still be compromised by his or her own preconceptions. This is why we need to keep on recasting the rationalist concept of global security in a sacral context like the Taoist one.

#### International organizations restrict spontaneity

Pettman 05, Ralf Pettman, Taoism and The Concept of Global Security, International Relations of the Asian-Pacific, 2005, <https://sci-hub.se/https://doi.org/10.1093/irap/lci103>, bracketed for gendered language, r0w@n

. In short, it tries to foster gentle friendships, true words, good government, due regulation, and effective deeds (Lao Tzu, 1997, pp. 11, 29, 31, 32, 37, 49, 75, 77, 81). Despite all the in-built universals (what constitutes wisdom or compassion? what is a true word? what is good government? what is an effective deed?), this concept is not a vague one. If it still seems so, it is given a graphic account in the practise of Taoist-inspired martial arts like that of tai 76 Ralph Pettman chi chuan, or judo, or aikido. In tai chi chuan the force of the opponent is returned or redirected, making it possible to prevail by yielding rather than by retaliating. This has important implications for conflict management and conflict resolution, even though it may well be one thing to redirect a punch to the person, and quite another to topple the global edifice of gender discrimination or capitalist exploitation, or to fight a guerrilla war. In Japanese judo, which is derived from the Chinese martial arts, weaker people learn to overcome stronger ones by moving in ways that do not offer resistance (Creel, 1970, p. 67). The same principle is manifest in aikido, a Taoist-style meditation in martial movement, where the purpose is to bring the self into accord ‘with the universe itself ’. This requires the practitioner to prevail over the ‘mind of discord’ in itself. In practice, this does not mean retreat. Nor does it mean retaliation. It means completing the task we all purportedly have, that is ‘to reconcile the world and make human beings one family’ (Uyeshiba, 1963, pp. 177, 178; Pettman, 1993). Returning to the analytic map of the concept of global security provided at the start, we can now compare the thinking of those who speak as liberal analysts of the inter-state system or society, for example, with their optimistic assumptions about the capacity for tit-for-tat behaviour, and Taoist thinking, which makes no such assumptions, and is not constrained by the rationalist context in which such assumptions are articulated. Wu-wei decrees no need to return tit-for-tat in promoting global security. It may mean practising reciprocity. It may not. There is no conceptual obligation either way, since ‘no unnatural action’ is not a contractual practice. The Tao te ching espouses a sense of the human whole instead. Since the Taoist also eschews legislated forms of morality, [they are] not bound to the kind of agreements that make international alliances and organizations possible. In dealing with global security matters, [they seek] to employ sacral spontaneity rather than analytic deliberation, artlessness rather than purposefulness, and to engage in action not planned in the more premeditated way. This sounds to rationalist ears like a recipe for disaster, since it appears to lack all the certainty they are used to in securing global affairs. There are no agreed rules, or agreed habits of international practice where rules cannot be established, or established ways of using force where co-operative means fail. They are likely to point to the Hitlers of this world, who revel in Taoist-style spontaneity, and who take millions of innocent people down with them. And they are right to do so. Taoists are not racist fascists, however. This kind of spontaneity is not Taoist, even when it gets couched in sacral terms. The key Taoist works read nothing like the ideological writings of a Hitler or one of his ilk. Indeed, they speak from a perspective that shows these writings to be human Taoism and the concept of global security 77 atavisms. They repudiate them comprehensively. Moreover, Hitler was the product of rationalism gone awry. Reaching for the mind-view that made for his rise in the first place is not what we necessarily want to do next. If we turn to the rationalist proponents of world government, we find those who are more optimistic than the liberals about the possibility of global governance, and we find that Taoists do not make this kind of assumption either. Nor do they accept the conceptual constraints involved. Taoists do not see people as being calculating or altruistic. In practise ‘no unnatural action’ makes for a mirror-like appraisal of the moment. It may mean promoting world governance or government. It may not. Given the sacral spontaneity that wu-wei represents, any policy choice may be preferred (Graham, 1981, p. 91). It will depend on what lets most people live out their lives relatively unharassed. In terms of the politico-economic (market-making) dimension to world affairs, the practice of wu-wei may or may not stand in stark contrast to the dog-eat-dog thinking of contemporary economic protectionists, the tit-for-tat thinking of global marketeers, and the hail-fellow-well-met thinking of international socialists. While protectionists always see a need to defend their country against the predatory behaviour of trading and investing ‘others’, Taoists may or may not feel obliged to respond with economic nationalism of this sort. Likewise with the free trading and investing practices that those who see human beings as basically calculating espouse (though the Tao te ching does eschew the stimulation of a desire for products that are hard to get). Nor do Taoists necessarily espouse the planned production and distribution policies that altruistic socialists find most congenial either (though the Tao te ching does recommend distributing a country’s wealth evenly, without legislating kindness). If we focus upon issues to do with global economic development and human want, we can see that Taoists are not constrained to the rationalist languages currently used here to do their thinking with. The concept of wu-wei frees us from the constraints these languages impose. This does not mean that wu-wei prescribes set developmental policies of some other kind, or has a solution it can bring to bear upon a specific famine (though Taoism does enjoin us to be frugal and content, foster the welfare of ordinary people, and not exalt riches). It does mean that wu-wei will always see economic well-being as part of the security equation, however, which is still not an acknowledged part of the rationalist approach to global security. It will always argue that people should not want, as well, which is not yet the basic position in the rationalist world either. In terms of the politico-social dimension to world affairs, we can see how the practice of wu-wei may or may not entail the dog-eat-dog thinking of 78 Ralph Pettman contemporary nationalists, the tit-for-tat thinking of modernist proponents of human rights and democracy, or the hail-fellow-well-met thinking of modernist proponents of social movements. Taoism is not constrained to any particular policy or policies. Indeed, it enjoins us not to get caught up in the conventional thinking that these rationalist ways of talking about the self-in-world-society represent. This does not make it a panacea (though the humane and caring character of Taoism would make it the basis for one, as would its sense of cosmic respect). It does invite us to move beyond the rationalist way of thinking, though, to entertain the Taoist level of experience, before deciding what to do. Which brings us to that part of the analytic map sketched at the beginning that accounts for those who emphasize the importance of human nurturing practices, not human nature. Classical marxists emphasize the materialist nature of the nurturing environment, articulating an analytic language that describes and explains the concept of global security in terms of the capitalist mode of production, capitalist exploitation, and the relevant class struggle. Neo-marxists add a mentalist note to this story to account for the hegemonic power of the ruling class, and its capacity to craft a concept of global security that serves its particular interests. Taoist spontaneity is radically different in that it does not portend any particular alternative to the analytic certainties (neo)marxist doctrines represent. Nor does it preclude the policies they prescribe or proscribe. Wu-wei practice seeks responses that are more immediate, instead, and more appropriate to the global security situation, as read as a whole, and from one moment to the next. It seeks a sense of the whole security situation, before affirming that sense in such a way as to nurture as many concerned as possible. Of the analytic languages that articulate preconceptions about human nurturing practices, constructivism is the one most like Taoism. This analytic language highlights the mentalist aspect of the nurturing environment. It does not recommend any particular policy response, since it merely highlights the mentally-made component to them all. Taoism can look very similar, particularly when we find the Tao te ching recommending that we should think as ordinary people think, which is just what the so-called ‘commonsense’ version of constructivism does (Pettman, 2000). While constructivism does not prescribe a particular way of thinking about the concept of global security, it is still rationalist, however, and it still constrains us to a mentalist rather than a materialist consideration of the concept. Taoism does not. It is non-rationalist and sacralist. And while most rationalists are likely to find this a recipe for epistemological anarchy, some may find that it is an opportunity to explore and assess productive ways of thinking that rationalism precludes. Taoism and the concept of global security 79 4.3 Comparing Taoist concerns with conventional strategic ones The dominant (though not necessarily the most important) language spoken about contemporary world affairs is the (neo)realist one. It articulates all of our dog-eat-dog notions about an anarchic world system, and global and regional balances of power. Compare the concept of wu-wei. This would seem to have nothing to do with the whole politico-strategic spectrum (Pettman, 1998, p. 176). On the one hand we have the classical realist dialect of alliance-hopping, and the neo-realist dialect of structural reasons for self-help. We have prescriptions for the pursuit of the national self-interest, and for the proscription of intervention in other states’ affairs. We have state-centricity, and pessimistic assumptions about human nature. On the other hand we have the Taoist determination to make no such assumptions and accept no such constraints. We have clear but not dogmatic opposition to conquest by force of arms. We have the decision to be as flexible as possible about what foreign policies to adopt, and how to implement them. We have the determination to act or react with profound, indeed sacral spontaneity. Rationalists aptly point out that anything less than sacral spontaneity is likely to fall flat on its face. While we wrestle with whether we are profound enough, however, we can always, as the Tao te ching recommends, keep the state’s biggest guns out of sight, treat them as unattractive (no parades or fly-pasts), use overt force extremely reluctantly, ensure that collateral human damage is kept to an absolute minimum if we do have to use force, and treat any success as a tragedy not a triumph. The ultimate issue in the politico-strategic realm is war. How does wu-wei apply here? Human warring is regularly analysed rationally in terms of a range of causes, kinds and consequences. The results of these analyses are used to plan appropriate politico-strategic practices, whether of an offensive, defensive, or pre-emptive kind. Human warring can also be analysed by meditating, however – that is, by not cogitating so self-consciously

#### Capitalism’s formations of desire are inherently against the flow of the universe
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However, Laozi does not necessarily advocate doing nothing, but as Li indicates, Laozi strongly advocates acting in accordance with the Dao.[12] Therefore, wuwei advocates action that does not violate the Dao. While this is somewhat vague, one can politically contextualize this to refer to Deng’s hexie shehui or ‘social harmony’. “Things that are hard and rigid are the companions of death, things that are subtle and soft are the companions of life” [13] In this quote Laozi espouses a subtle approach to societal change, which was Deng’s philosophy on how to help China transition from its Maoist past. This policy of economic gradualism can be contrasted with the legalist approach taken in the aftermath of the USSR. While Deng sought to slowly move China into the wider free-market system without disrupting the social order, the post-USSR state sought to engage in an approach of ‘economic shock therapy’.[14] In other words, a gradual approach to transition under Deng seemed to be more in tune with the Daoist proposition that one must only act under the pretext that the Dao, or social harmony is protected. While I recognize that this is only one way to contextualize the Dao, it does paint an interesting picture of Daoist influences on modern China. However, even Daoism as an expression of capitalist individualism is not an inscrutable theory. Zhuangzi often espouses the idea that a proper follower of the Dao will lose himself in pursuit of the Dao.[15] In other words, this is a contradiction to the laissez-faire economics of capitalist philosophy that believes ‘to get rich is glorious’. The apparent contradiction in Daoist belief between self-cultivation and the pursuit of the Dao also manifests in different political ideologies. If one believes in the divine right of a ruler, would it not follow that the ruler’s subject would entrust the ruler to act in accordance with the Dao? Subsequently, the subject would then forgo his individual self-cultivation in favour of the pursuit of the Dao, which in the political sphere would involve forgoing individual freedom.[16] Our identities and our capitalist pursuits in the marketplace are based on a sense of self that has free will and self-determination. If we do not have a sense of self, and thus have no ideals of self-determination, then it might follow that we also have no profound right to govern as we so wish to. Ultimately, Daoism also does propagate against striving for anything, which is a slight issue when it is compared with capitalism. A subsequent thought that stands as an issue when thinking of Deng’s economic capitalism in accordance with Daoism is the subsequent environmental degradation that has been paramount across the Chinese economy. Daoist imagery often has its basis in streams, forests, and rivers that have been ravaged by the capitalist economic machine. Market capitalism is thought to put human ambition above the natural elements, which is not something Daoist thinkers would be inclined to support. To go along with the theme above, the state must act while simultaneously not violating the Dao. Oftentimes, it has been reported that the Chinese state model has been complicit in environmental degradation in order to maximize the success of state-owned enterprises in the free market. If the Dao is natural, then should one not maintain that the state should act against a collective human ambition that messes with the natural order of the environment? The ambition-driven individualist often finds himself at odds with the natural order of the Dao. In many ways, nefarious activities have given rise to a disruption in the natural order, leading to ecological calamities such as the melting of the polar ice caps and mass floods on a global scale. Considering Daoism warned against striving ambition when it contradicts the Dao, it appears as though it also warned against Deng’s economic model that led to these environmental outcomes.

#### Capitalism needs some good Daoist values
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There is a pattern of energy-flows, a way of how nature proceeds. The Daoist sage (shengren 聖 人) knows how to abide by this pattern and ‘go with the flow’. In the Daodejing 道德經, this idea is expressed in the demand “to be the stream of the universe” (c. 28), for “the universe is sacred; you cannot improve it” (c. 29).26 The reason is a pragmatic concern, motivated by self-interest: “what goes against the Dao comes to an early end” (c. 30).27 Seen in this way, the climate emergency is the outcome of not following the Dao. Instead of going with nature’s flow, humanity went against it and now risks coming to an early end in the hothouse fate. The sixth mass extinction is yet another consequence of going against the Dao, and it is also symptomatic of humanity dismissing Daoist values. Central to Daoist values is the rejection of destructiveness, domination, and competition. The Daodejing counsels, “Achieve results, but not through violence” (c. 30).28 The Daoist cherishes three core values or ‘treasures’ (san bao 三寶); they are mercy (ci 慈), frugality (jian 儉), and humility (hou 後; c. 67). The environmental crisis is the effect of disregarding these treasures: instead of mercy, civilization proceeds with a lack of empathy; instead of frugality, civilization embraces capitalism; and instead of humility, civilization indulges in hubris. Doing violence to nature shows a lack of wisdom. The Daodejing warns: “When humans lack a sense of awe, there will be disaster” (c. 72).29 Unlike religions whose practitioners indulge in climate skepticism, as the powerful Evangelical Protestant pluralities in USA, Australia, and Brazil, there is no place in Daoism for such indulgencies. Its teachings already contain explicit warnings of the new realities. Furthermore, its holy scriptures need no interpretive retrofit. Without need for exegetical modification, they can serve as spiritual framework for the challenges of the Anthropocene. Unlike Evangelicals, Daoists can simply say, we told you so. Next to the subordination of culture to nature and the precept of following the Dao, there is a third motif, which could be called ‘soft anthropocentrism’. As we have seen, the proper place of humanity is its harmonious integration in nature. Instead of dominating nature, civilization ought to aspire to a cultural paradigm of mercy, frugality, and humility. And yet, humans occupy a special place in the universe. The Classic of the Great Peace or Taipingjing 太平经, a collection of Daoist scriptures from the Han dynasty, has this to say about humans:

#### The alternative is wu-wei- a deferential act of habit forming

Ames and Hall 10. Roger Ames and David Hall (Ames is a Canadian philosopher at the University of Peking. Hall was a professor of philosophy at the University of Texas), 2010, “Daodejing: Making this Life Significant,” Ballantine Books, I have a pdf, r0w@n

The compilers of the Daodejing seek rather explicitly to develop a contrast between the glimpses of insight this text strives to impart, and the substance of other philosophical doctrines. Many if not most doctrines evolve with their antecedents in an elaborate genealogy of values and ideas. These philosophical doctrines are often hierarchically structured by precepts and governing principles, and they may well require an extended course of study for their mastery and transmission. The precepts that inform these “doctrines” are professionalized by their learned “doctors,” and within their marble academies these erudites—for appropriate status and recompense— are only too glad to amaze the hoi poloi with the ashing dexterity of their philosophic thrusts and parries. What the Daodejing has to offer, on the other hand, is much simpler. It encourages the cultivation of a disposition that is captured in what we have chosen to call its wu-forms. The wu-forms free up the energy required to sustain the abstract cognitive and moral sensibilities of technical philosophy, allowing this energy, now unmediated by concepts, theories, and contrived moral precepts, to be expressed as those concrete feelings that inspire the ordinary business of the day. It is through these concrete feelings that one is able to know the world and to optimize the human experience. The abstraction of the concrete ethical dimension of such felt knowing into a formal moralist vocabulary is rehearsed in chapter 38 of the Daodejing: Thus, only when we have lost sight of way-making is there excellence, Only when we have lost sight of excellence is there authoritative conduct, Only when we have lost sight of authoritative conduct is there appropriateness, And only when we have lost sight of appropriateness is there ritual propriety. As for ritual propriety, it is the thinnest veneer of doing one’s best and making good on one’s word, And it is the first sign of trouble. “Foreknowledge” is tinsel decorating the way, And is the first sign of ignorance. It is for this reason that persons of consequence: Set store by the substance rather than the veneer And by the fruit rather than the flower. Hence, eschewing one they take the other. The moral precepts described in the first two stanzas emerge as objects of reverence, but as hallowed as they might become, they are anemic when compared to the love and life of concrete, spontaneous feelings. It is the “substance” and the “fruit”—the passionate experience of life itself—rather than a catechism of bloodless ethical principles, that is the real site of knowing. Such felt knowing is an ongoing process of focal and field awareness—of way-making—that can only be sustained with indefatigable resolution. Indeed, it is not an easy business to stay focused. Even though the Daodejing’s teachings on how to cultivate the most effective disposition for making one’s way in the world could not be put in more straightforward terms, still “when the very best scholars learn of way-making they are just barely able to keep to its center” (chapter 41). Were we to search for something like a central insight that defines the Daoist sensibility, we might discover that a “single thread” pervades the text. The central focus of the Daoist way of thinking is the decisive role of deference in the establishment and preservation of relationships. As we have said above, integrity in a processual worldview is not being one, but becoming one in the consummatory relationships that one is able to achieve within a context of environing particulars. Deference involves a yielding (and being yielded to) grounded in an acknowledgment of the shared excellence of particular foci (de) in the process of one’s own self- cultivation. Deferential acts require that one put oneself literally in the place of the other, and in so doing, incorporate what was the object of deference into what is one’s own developing disposition. And one’s own disposition thus fortified becomes available as a locus of deference for others. In Confucianism, self is determined by sustained effort (zbong page50image65796320) in deferential transactions (shu page50image65788832) guided by ritually structured roles and relations (li page50image65786128) that project one’s person outward into society and into culture. Such a person becomes a focus of the community’s deference (junzi page50image65783840) and a source of its spirituality (shen ). Daoism, on the other hand, expresses its deferential activity through what we are calling the wu-forms. The three most familiar articulations of this pervasive sensibility are: wuwei page50image65857072, wuzhi page50image65845888, and wuyu page50image65634304. These are, respectively, noncoercive actions in accordance with the de (“particular focus”) of things; a sort of knowing without resort to rules or principles; and desiring which does not seek to possess or control its “object.” In each of these instances, as in the case of Confucian shu, it is necessary to put oneself in the place of what is to be acted in accordance with, what is to be known, or what is to be desired, and thus incorporate this perspective into one’s own disposition. Our chief aim here is to demonstrate how this explicitly Daoist understanding of deferential activity presupposes a focus-field model of self. Given our discussion of the inseparability of feeling and thinking —the affective and the cognitive—in the Daoist heart-and-mind (xin), the conflict associated with the self that the Daoist sage must overcome cannot be a struggle among some compartmentalized rational, appetitive, and emotional faculties. Indeed, given the relational and unpartitioned model of the self characterized by xin, it is dicult to imagine how there could be anything like an internal dynamics that would be a source of agitation. It is unlikely that we would nd Hamlets or St. Pauls prominent among the Daoists. If the problematic of unrealized selfhood does not entail a self divided against itself, what is the source and the nature of the disturbance that the cultivation of the Daoist disposition is meant to overcome? If it is not referenced primarily within an individuating soul, it can only be a disturbance in the relationships that constitute the context of self-consummation. Said another way, if a person is page50image65634512 not in fact constituted by some essential, partitioned “soul,” but is rather seen as dynamic pattern of personal, social, and natural relationships, agitation must arise as a consequence of poor management of these constitutive roles and relationships. Hence, agitation in the heart-and-mind is not narrowly “psychological,” but is more accurately conceived of as of broad ethical concern: How should we act and what should we do? To summarize the three most prominent examples of the wu-forms that we have discussed in more detail elsewhere,20 wuwei page51image65652976, often translated (unfortunately) as “no action” or “non-action,” really involves the absence of any course of action that interferes with the particular focus (de page51image65653184) of those things contained within one’s field of influence. Actions uncompromised by stored knowledge or ingrained habits are relatively unmediated: they are accommodating and spontaneous. As such, these actions are the result of deferential responses to the item or the event in accordance with which, or in relation to which, one is acting. These actions are ziran page51image65653392, “spontaneous” and “self-so-ing,” and as such, are nonassertive actions. It is not through an internal struggle of reason against the passions but through “acuity (ming page51image65653600)”—a mirroring of the things of the world as they are in their interdependent relations with us—that we reach a state in which nothing among all of the myriad of “the goings on” in the world will be able to agitate our hearts-and-minds, and we are able to promote the flourishing of our world. In other words, we defer in attaining integrity with those things that contextualize us, establishing a frictionless equilibrium with them. And it is this state of achieved equilibrium that is precisely the relationship most conducive to symbiotic growth and productivity. The Daoist sages in Zhuangzi are described in such terms: The stillness of the sages is not simply a matter of their saying: “Stillness is good!” and hence they are still. Rather, they are still because none of the myriad things are able to agitate their hearts-and-mind. When water is still, it illuminates one’s whiskers and eyebrows, and in its placidity, it provides a standard so that skilled artisans can take their measure from it. If the stillness of water provides illumination, how much more so one’s spirit. The stillness of the heart-and-mind of the sage makes it mirror to the whole world and the looking glass for all of the myriad things.21 The notion of jing page52image65681008—stillness, tranquillity—that is often used to characterize this posture, far from being simple passivity, is an ongoing, dynamic achievement of equilibrium that requires constant monitoring and adjustment. It is important to remember that all correlative pairs entail their opposites in the sense that jing is “tranquillity-becoming-agitated.” Thus, tranquillity (jing) stands in a dominant relationship in its partnership with agitation (dong page52image65681216); it does not negate or exclude its opposite. The same qualification has to be brought to bear on other familiar pairs that might otherwise mislead us: for example, emptiness (xu page52image65681424) and fullness (shi page52image65681632), and clarity (qing ) and turbidity (zhuo page52image65681840). Wuzhi , often translated as “no-knowledge,” actually means the absence of a certain kind of knowledge—the kind of knowledge that is dependent upon ontological presence: that is, the assumption that there is some unchanging reality behind appearance. Knowledge grounded in a denial of ontological presence involves “acosmotic” thinking: the type of thinking that does not presuppose a single-ordered (“One behind the many”) world, and its intellectual accoutrements. It is, therefore, unprincipled knowing. Such knowing does not appeal to rules or principles determining the existence, the meaning, or the activity of a phenomenon. Wuzhi provides one with a sense of the de of a thing— its particular uniqueness and focus— rather than yielding an understanding of that thing in relation to some concept or natural kind or universal. Ultimately, wuzhi is a grasp of the daode page52image65682048relationship of each encountered item that permits an understanding of this particular focus (de) and the eld that it construes. Knowledge, as unprincipled knowing, is the acceptance of the world on its own terms without recourse to rules of discrimination that separate one sort of thing from another. Rules of thumb, habits of mind and action, established customs, fixed standards, received page52image65682256

# Patent Obviousness Doctrine CP

#### CP Text – Members states of the World Trade Organization ought to invigorate the existing patent obviousness doctrine to minimize patent evergreening of medicines.

#### It competes – the Plan explicitly defends all IP,

#### That solves innovation without ridding ourselves of every secondary patent that could lead to improvements.

1AC Feldman 19 Robin Feldman 2-11-2019 "‘One-and-done’ for new drugs could cut patent thickets and boost generic competition" <https://www.statnews.com/2019/02/11/drug-patent-protection-one-done/> (Arthur J. Goldberg Distinguished Professor of Law, Albert Abramson ’54 Distinguished Professor of Law Chair, and Director of the Center for Innovation)//SidK + Elmer

One-and-done would apply to both patents and exclusivities. **A more limited approach**, a baby step if you will, **would be to invigorate the existing patent obviousness doctrine as a way to cut back on patent tinkering.** Obviousness, **one of the five standards for patent eligibility**, **says that inventions that are obvious to an expert** or the general public **can’t be patented**. Either **by congressional clarification or judicial interpretation,** **many pile-on patents could be eliminated with a ruling that the core concept of the additional patent is nothing more than the original formulation**. **Anything else is merely an obvious adaptation** of the core invention, modified with existing technology. As such, **the patent would fail for being perfectly obvious.** Even without congressional action, a more vigorous and robust application of the existing obviousness doctrine could significantly improve the problem of piled-up patents and patent walls.

#### Secondary patents are good, solve many medication problems, and increase innovation which turns the Aff.

Stevens and Ezell 20 Philip Stevens and Stephen Ezell 2-3-2020 "Delinkage Debunked: Why Replacing Patents With Prizes for Drug Development Won’t Work" <https://itif.org/publications/2020/02/03/delinkage-debunked-why-replacing-patents-prizes-drug-development-wont-work> (Philip founded Geneva Network in 2015. His main research interests are the intersection of intellectual property, trade, and health policy. Formerly he was an official at the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) in Geneva, where he worked in its Global Challenges Division on a range of IP and health issues. Prior to his time with WIPO, Philip worked as director of policy for International Policy Network, a UK-based think tank, as well as holding research positions with the Adam Smith Institute and Reform, both in London. He has also worked as a political risk consultant and a management consultant. He is a regular columnist in a wide range of international newspapers and has published a number of academic studies. He holds degrees from the London School of Economics and Durham University (UK).)//Elmer

The **Current System** Has **Produced a Tremendous Amount of Life-Sciences Innovation** The frontier for biomedical innovation is seemingly limitless, and the challenges remain numerous—whether it comes to diseases that afflict millions, such as cancer or malaria, or the estimated 7,000 rare diseases that afflict fewer than 200,000 patients.24 And while certainly citizens in developed and developing nations confront differing health challenges, those challenges are increasingly converging. For instance, as of this year, analysts expect that **noncommunicable** diseases such as cardiovascular disease and diabetes will account for 70 percent of natural fatalities **in developing countries**.25 Citizens of low- and middle-income countries bear 80 percent of the world’s death burden from cardiovascular disease.26 Forty-six percent of Africans over 25 suffer from hypertension, more than anywhere else in the world. Similarly, 85 percent of the disease burden of cervical cancer is borne by individuals living in low- and middle-income countries.27 To develop treatments or cures for these conditions, novel biomedical innovation **will be needed from everywhere**. Yet tremendous progress has been made in recent decades. To tackle these challenges, the global pharmaceutical industry invested over **$1.36 trillion in R&D** in the decade from 2007 to 2016—and it’s expected that annual R&D investment by the global pharmaceutical industry will reach $181 billion by 2022.28 In no small part due to that investment, **943 new active substances have been introduced** globally over the prior 25 years.29 The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has approved more than **500 new medicines since 2000** alone. And these medicines are getting to more individuals: Global medicine use **in 2020 will reach 4.5 trillion doses**, up 24 percent from 2015.30 Moreover, there are an estimated 7,000 new medicines under development globally (about half of them in the United States), with 74 percent being potentially first in class, meaning they use a new and unique mechanism of action for treating a medical condition.31 In the United States, over 85 percent of all drugs sold are generics (only 10 percent of U.S. prescriptions are filled by brand-name drugs).32 And while some assert that biotechnology companies focus too often on “me-too” drugs that compete with other treatments already on the market, the reality is many drugs currently under development are meant to tackle some of the **world’s most intractable diseases**, **including cancer and Alzheimer’s**.33 Moreover, such arguments miss that many of the drugs developed in recent years have in fact been first of their kind. For instance, in 2014, the FDA approved **41 new medicines** (at that point, the most since 1996) many of which were first-in-class medicines.34 In that year, 28 of the 41 drugs approved were considered biologic or specialty agents, and 41 percent of medicines approved were intended to treat rare diseases.35 Yet even when a new drug isn’t first of its kind, it can still produce benefits for patients, both through **enhanced clinical efficacy** (for instance, taking the treatment as a pill rather than an injection, with a superior dosing regimen, **or better treatment** for some individuals who don’t respond well to the original drug) and by generating competition that exerts downward price pressures. For example, a patient needing a cholesterol drug has a host of statins from which to choose, which is important because some statins produce harmful side effects for some patients. Similarly, patients with osteoporosis can choose from Actonel, Boniva, or Fosomax. Or take for example Hepatitis C, which until recently was an incurable disease eventually requiring a liver transplant for many patients. In 2013, a revolutionary new treatment called Solvadi was released that boosted cure rates to 90 percent. This was followed in 2014 by an improved treatment called Harvoni, which cures the Hepatitis C variant left untouched by Solvadi. Since then, an astonishing six new treatments for the disease have received FDA approval, opening up a wide range of treatment options that take into account patients’ liver and kidney status, co-infections, potential drug interactions, previous treatment failures, and the genotype of HCV virus.36 “If you have to have Hepatitis C, now is the time to have it,” as Douglas Dieterich, a liver specialist at the Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai Hospital in New York, told the Financial Times. “We have these marvellous drugs we can treat you with right now, without side effects,” he added. “And this time next year, we’ll have another round of drugs available.”37 Moreover, the financial potential of this new product category has led to multiple competing products entering the market in quick succession, in turn placing downward pressure on prices.38 As Geoffrey Dusheiko and Charles Gore write in The Lancet, “The market has done its work for HCV treatments: after competing antiviral regimens entered the market, competition and innovative price negotiations have driven costs down from the initially high list prices in developed countries.”39 As noted previously, opponents of the current market- and IP-based system contend patents enable their holders to exploit a (temporary) market monopoly by inflating prices many multiples beyond the marginal cost of production. But rather than a conventional neoclassical analysis, an analysis based on “innovation economics” finds it is exactly this “distortion” that is required for innovation to progress. As William Baumol has pointed out, “Prices above marginal costs and price discrimination become the norm rather than the exception because … without such deviations from behaviour in the perfectly competitive model, innovation outlays and other unavoidable and repeated sunk outlays cannot be recouped.”40 Or, as the U.S. Congressional Office of Technology Assessment found, “Pharmaceutical R&D is a risky investment; therefore, high financial returns are necessary **to induce companies to invest** in researching new chemical entities.”41 This is also why, in 2018, the U.S. Congressional Budget Office estimated that because of high failure rates, biopharmaceutical **companies would need to earn a 61.8 percent rate of return on their successful new drug R&D projects in order to match a 4.8 percent after-tax rate of return on their investment**s.42 Indeed, **it’s the ability to recoup fixed costs, not just marginal** costs, through mechanisms such as patent protection that lies at the heart of all innovation-based industries and indeed all innovation and related economic progress. If companies could not find a way to pay for their R&D costs, and could only charge for the costs of producing the compound, **there would be no new drugs developed**, just as there would be no new products developed in any industry. Innovating in the life sciences remains expensive, risky, difficult, and uncertain. Just 1 in 5,000 drug candidates make it all the way from discovery to market.43 A 2018 study by the Deloitte Center for Health Solutions, “Unlocking R&D productivity: Measuring the return from pharmaceutical innovation 2018,” found that “the average cost to develop an asset [an innovative life-sciences drug] including the cost of failure, has increased in six out of eight years,” and that the average cost to create a new drug has risen to $2.8 billion.44 Related research has found the development of new drugs requires years of painstaking, risky, and expensive research that, for a new pharmaceutical compound, takes an average of 11.5 to 15 years of research, development, and clinical trials, at a cost of $1.7 billion to $3.2 billion.45 IP rights—including patents, copyrights, and data exclusivity protections—give innovators, whether in the life sciences or other sectors, the confidence to undertake the risky and expensive process of innovation, secure in the knowledge they’ll be able to capture a share of the gains from their efforts. And these gains are often only a small fraction of the true value created. For instance, Yale University economist William Nordhaus estimated inventors capture just 4 percent of the total social gains from their innovations; the rest spill over to other companies and society as a whole.46 Without adequate IP protection, private investors would never find it viable to fund advanced research because lower-cost copiers would be in a position to undercut the legitimate prices (and profits) of innovators, even while still generating substantial profits on their own.47 As the report “Wealth, Health and International Trade in the 21st Century” concludes, “Conferring robust intellectual property rights is, in the pharmaceutical and other technological-development contexts, in the global public’s long-term interests. Without adequate mechanisms for directly and indirectly securing the private and public funding of medicines and vaccines, research and development communities across the world will lose future benefits that would far outweigh the development costs involved.”48 Put simply, the current market- and IP-based life-sciences innovation system is producing life-changing biomedical innovation. As Jack Scannell, a senior fellow at Oxford University’s Center for the Advancement of Sustainable Medical Innovation has explained, “I would guess that one can buy today, at rock bottom generic prices, a set of small-molecule drugs that has greater medical utility than the entire set available to anyone, anywhere, at any price in 1995.” He continued, “Nearly all the generic medicine chest was created by firms who invested in R&D to win future profits that they tried pretty hard to maximize; short-term financial gain building a long-term common good.”49 For example, on September 14, 2017, the FDA approved Mvasi, the first biosimilar for Roche’s Avastin, a breakthrough anticancer drug when it came out in the mid-1990s for lung, cervical, and colorectal cancer.50 In other words, a medicine to treat forms of cancer that barely existed 20 years ago is now available as a generic drug today. It’s this dynamic that enables us to imagine a situation wherein drugs to treat diseases that aren’t available anywhere at any price today (for instance, treatments for Alzheimer’s or Parkinson’s) might be available as generics in 20 years. But that will only be the case if we preserve (and improve where possible) a life-sciences innovation system that is generally working. The current system does not require wholesale replacement by a prize-based system that—notwithstanding a meaningful success here or there—has produced nowhere near a similar level of novel biomedical innovation.

#### Case

#### CONCEDED IN CROSS- EVERGREENING IS DETERMINED BY PHARMA AND THAT DOESN”T CHANGE\_ THEY CAN JUTS CHOOSE WHAT THEY THINK IS AN ORPHAN DRUG- TAKES OUT THE ENTIRE AFF