

not given up on the theory of historical determinism—they still believe that communism will inevitably triumph over capitalism. But the transition to communism will come sooner if the prophets of the movement can succeed in unmasking capitalist symbols. Thus, for Marxist theorists, any effort of Western governments to do good can only be for the purpose of masking evil intentions. The critique, therefore, becomes the ultimate good is really bad argument. Anything that the United States federal government does that seems (on the surface) to be good is actually bad because it only serves to delay the inevitable transition to a communist future.

Defenders of various postmodern critiques might argue that their particular theorist has moved beyond the Marxist grand narrative. Yet if you look under the hood, almost every postmodern theorist (Foucault, Derrida, Lyotard, Agamben, Baudrillard, Lacan, Kristeva, Irigaray, Deleuze, and numerous others) unabashedly pursues the Marxist narrative. The purpose of their critique is to unmask the evils of capitalism so that it can more quickly be overthrown.

I draw the connection between the postmodern critique and Marxism not to tar-and-feather postmodern theorists with a Marxist label. Serious scholars should certainly be free to debate the merits of Marxism. I draw the connection so that the debater can understand why postmodern theorists are so concerned with the *unmasking* of motives and assumptions.

The profound skepticism of the postmodern theorist leads to the conclusion that any seemingly beneficent act of U.S. policymakers must have the motive of masking the evils of capitalism. Thus, the seemingly good act becomes bad because it perpetuates the violence and evil of capitalism, giving it an extended life in the United States and undeserved credibility in the recipient countries. Whatever undermines Western power and influence is, therefore, ultimately good. This prompted one of the leading French postmodern theorists, Jean Baudrillard, to make the following comment about the 9/11 terrorist attacks: The entire world wanted the event to happen. In essence, it was the terrorists who committed the deed but it is we who wished for it (as quoted in *The Australian*, Oct. 12, 2004, p. 29).

HOW ARE CRITIQUES USED IN POLICY DEBATES?

Consider the following example: An affirmative case calls for a doubling of U.S. public health assistance to help provide safe water and sanitation services in sub-Saharan Africa. The affirmative case, however, uses the language of human rights, arguing that access to safe water is a basic human right. The negative team bases its attack on the savage/victim/savior (SVS) critique made famous by Makau Mutua, a law professor at the State University of New York at Buffalo. According to Mutua in his 2002 book