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#### The affirmative’s claims to how China will act and react to certain policies like the plan depends on a rationalization of China – this flawed positivist epistemology seeks to render all of the international arena knowable and predictable – the result is the inevitable emergence of a ‘China threat’ based on orientalization

**Pan 4** – prof school of international and political studies, Deakin U. PhD in pol sci and IR, (Chengxin, “The "China threat" in American self-imagination: the discursive construction of other as power politics,” 1 June 2004, http://www.articlearchives.com/asia/northern-asia-china/796470-1.html)

Having examined how the "China threat" literature is enabled by and serves the purpose of a particular U.S. self-construction, I want to turn now to the issue of how this literature represents a discursive construction of other, instead of an "objective" account of Chinese reality. This, I argue, has less to do with its portrayal of China as a threat per se than with its essentialization and totalization of China as an externally knowable object, independent of historically contingent contexts or dynamic international interactions. In this sense, the discursive construction of China as a threatening other cannot be detached from (neo)realism, a positivist, ahistorical framework of analysis within which global life is reduced to endless interstate rivalry for power and survival. As many critical IR scholars have noted, (neo)realism is not a transcendent description of global reality but is predicated on the modernist Western identity, which, in the quest for scientific certainty, has come to define itself essentially as the sovereign territorial nation-state. This realist self-identity of Western states leads to the constitution of anarchy as the sphere of insecurity, disorder, and war. In an anarchical system, as (neo)realists argue, "the gain of one side is often considered to be the loss of the other," (45) and "All other states are potential threats." (46) In order to survive in such a system, states inevitably pursue power or capability. In doing so, these realist claims represent what R. B. J. Walker calls "a specific historical articulation of relations of universality/particularity and self/Other." (47) The (neo)realist paradigm has dominated the U.S. IR discipline in general and the U.S. China studies field in particular. As Kurt Campbell notes, after the end of the Cold War, a whole new crop of China experts "are much more likely to have a background in strategic studies or international relations than China itself." (48) As a result, for those experts to know China is nothing more or less than to undertake a geopolitical analysis of it, often by asking only a few questions such as how China will "behave" in a strategic sense and how it may affect the regional or global balance of power, with a particular emphasis on China's military power or capabilities. As Thomas J. Christensen notes, "Although many have focused on intentions as well as capabilities, the most prevalent component of the [China threat] debate is the assessment of China's overall future military power compared with that of the United States and other East Asian regional powers." (49) Consequently, almost **by default, China emerges** **as** an absolute other and **a threat** thanks to this (neo)realist prism. The (neo)realist emphasis on survival and security in international relations dovetails perfectly with the U.S. self-imagination, because for the United States to define itself as the indispensable nation in a world of anarchy is often to demand absolute security. As James Chace and Caleb Carr note, "for over two centuries the aspiration toward an eventual condition of absolute security has been viewed as central to an effective American foreign policy." (50) And this self-identification in turn leads to the definition of not only "tangible" foreign powers but global contingency and uncertainty per se as threats. For example, former U.S. President George H. W. Bush repeatedly said that "the enemy [of America] is unpredictability. The enemy is instability." (51) Similarly, arguing for the continuation of U.S. Cold War alliances, a high-ranking Pentagon official asked, "if we pull out, who knows what nervousness will result?" (52) Thus understood, by its very uncertain character, China would now automatically constitute a threat to the United States. For example, Bernstein and Munro believe that "China's political unpredictability, the always-present possibility that it will fall into a state of domestic disunion and factional fighting," constitutes a source of danger. (53) In like manner, Richard Betts and Thomas Christensen write: If the PLA [People's Liberation Army] remains second-rate, should the world breathe a sigh of relief? Not entirely.... Drawing China into the web of global interdependence may do more to encourage peace than war, but it cannot guarantee that the pursuit of heartfelt political interests will be blocked by a fear of economic consequences.... U.S. efforts to create a stable balance across the Taiwan Strait might deter the use of force under certain circumstances, but certainly not all. (54) The upshot, therefore, is that since China displays no absolute certainty for peace, it must be, by definition, an uncertainty, and hence, a threat. In the same way, a multitude of other unpredictable factors (such as ethnic rivalry, local insurgencies, overpopulation, drug trafficking, environmental degradation, rogue states, the spread of weapons of mass destruction, and international terrorism) have also been labeled as "threats" to U.S. security. Yet, it seems that in the post-Cold War environment, China represents a kind of uncertainty par excellence. "Whatever the prospects for a more peaceful, more democratic, and more just world order, nothing seems more uncertain today than the future of post-Deng China," (55) argues Samuel Kim. And such an archetypical uncertainty is crucial to the enterprise of U.S. self-construction, because it seems that only an uncertainty with potentially global consequences such as China could justify U.S. indispensability or its continued world dominance. In this sense, Bruce Cumings aptly suggested in 1996 that China (as a threat) was basically "a metaphor for an enormously expensive Pentagon that has lost its bearings and that requires a formidable 'renegade state' to define its mission (Islam is rather vague, and Iran lacks necessary weights)." (56) It is mainly on the basis of this self-fashioning that many U.S. scholars have for long claimed their "expertise" on China. For example, from his observation (presumably on Western TV networks) of the Chinese protest against the U.S. bombing of their embassy in Belgrade in May 1999, Robert Kagan is confident enough to speak on behalf of the whole Chinese people, claiming that he knows "the fact" of "what [China] really thinks about the United States." That is, "they consider the United States an enemy--or, more precisely, the enemy.... How else can one interpret the Chinese government's response to the bombing?" he asks, rhetorically. (57) For Kagan, because the Chinese "have no other information" than their government's propaganda, the protesters cannot rationally "know" the whole event as "we" do. Thus, their anger must have been orchestrated, unreal, and hence need not be taken seriously. (58) Given that Kagan heads the U.S. Leadership Project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and is very much at the heart of redefining the United States as the benevolent global hegemon, his confidence in speaking for the Chinese "other" is perhaps not surprising. In a similar vein, without producing in-depth analysis, Bernstein and Munro invoke with great ease such all-encompassing notions as "the Chinese tradition" and its "entire three-thousand-year history." (59) In particular, they repeatedly speak of what China's "real" goal is: "China is an unsatisfied and ambitious power whose goal is to dominate Asia.... China aims at achieving a kind of hegemony.... China is so big and so naturally powerful that [we know] it will tend to dominate its region even if it does not intend to do so as a matter of national policy." (60) Likewise, with the goal of absolute security for the United States in mind, Richard Betts and Thomas Christensen argue: The truth is that China can pose a grave problem even if it does not become a military power on the American model, does not intend to commit aggression, integrates into a global economy, and liberalizes politically. Similarly, the United States could face a dangerous conflict over Taiwan even if it turns out that Beijing lacks the capacity to conquer the [island](http://www.articlearchives.com/asia/northern-asia-china/796470-1.html).... This is true because of geography; because of America's reliance on alliances to project power; and because of China's capacity to harm U.S. forces, U.S. regional allies, and the American homeland, even while losing a war in the technical, military sense. (61) By now, it seems clear that neither China's capabilities nor intentions really matter. Rather, almost by its mere geographical existence, China has been qualified as an absolute strategic "other," **a discursive construct from which it cannot escape**. Because of this, "China" in U.S. IR discourse has been objectified and deprived of its own subjectivity and exists mainly in and for the U.S. self. Little wonder that for many U.S. China specialists, China becomes merely a "national security concern" for the United States, with the "severe disproportion between the keen attention to China as a security concern and the intractable neglect of China's [own] security concerns in the current debate." (62) At this point, at issue here is no longer whether the "China threat" argument is true or false, but is rather its reflection of a shared positivist mentality among mainstream China experts that they know China better than do the Chinese themselves. (63) "We" alone can know for sure that they consider "us" their enemy and thus pose a menace to "us." Such an account of China, in many ways, **strongly seems to resemble Orientalists' problematic distinction between the West and the Orient**. Like orientalism, the U.S. construction of the Chinese "other" does not require that China acknowledge the validity of that dichotomous construction. Indeed, as Edward Said point out, "It is enough for 'us' to set up these distinctions in our own minds; [and] **'they' become 'they' accordingly**." (64) It may be the case that there is nothing inherently wrong with perceiving others through one's own subjective lens. Yet, what is problematic with mainstream U.S. China watchers is that they refuse to acknowledge the legitimacy of the inherent fluidity of Chinese identity and subjectivity and try instead to fix its ambiguity as absolute difference from "us," a kind of certainty that denotes nothing but otherness and threats. As a result, it becomes difficult to find a legitimate space for alternative ways of understanding an inherently volatile, amorphous China (65) or to recognize that China's future trajectory in global politics is contingent essentially on how "we" in the United States and the West in general want to see it as well as on how the Chinese choose to shape it. (66) Indeed, discourses of "us" and "them" are always closely linked to how "we" as "what we are" deal with "them" as "what they are" in the practical realm. This is exactly how the discursive strategy of perceiving China as a threatening other should be understood, a point addressed in the following section, which explores some of the practical dimension of this discursive strategy in the containment perspectives and hegemonic ambitions of U.S. foreign policy.

#### This manifests itself in a drive for certainty which causes endless violence

Burke, 7 (Senior Lecturer in International Relations at the University of New South Wales at Sydney, Anthony, Johns Hopkins University Press, Ontologies of War: Violence, Existence and Reason, Project Muse)

This essay develops a theory about the causes of war -- and thus aims to generate lines of action and critique for peace -- that cuts beneath analyses based either on a given sequence of events, threats, insecurities and political manipulation, or the play of institutional, economic or political interests (the 'military-industrial complex'). Such factors are important to be sure, and should not be discounted, but they flow over a deeper bedrock of modern reason that has not only come to form a powerful structure of common sense but the apparently solid ground of the real itself. In this light, the two 'existential' and 'rationalist' discourses of war-making and justification mobilised in the Lebanon war are more than merely arguments, rhetorics or even discourses. Certainly they mobilise forms of knowledge and power together; providing political leaderships, media, citizens, bureaucracies and military forces with organising systems of belief, action, analysis and rationale. But they run deeper than that. They are truth-systems of the most powerful and fundamental kind that we have in modernity: ontologies, statements about truth and being which claim a rarefied privilege to state what is and how it must be maintained as it is. I am thinking of ontology in both its senses: ontology as both a statement about the nature and ideality of being (in this case political being, that of the nation-state), and as a statement of epistemological truth and certainty, of methods and processes of arriving at certainty (in this case, the development and application of strategic knowledge for the use of armed force, and the creation and maintenance of geopolitical order, security and national survival). These derive from the classical idea of ontology as a speculative or positivistic inquiry into the fundamental nature of truth, of being, or of some phenomenon; the desire for a solid metaphysical account of things inaugurated by Aristotle, an account of 'being qua being and its essential attributes'.17 In contrast, drawing on Foucauldian theorising about truth and power, I see ontology as a particularly powerful claim to truth itself: a claim to the status of an underlying systemic foundation for truth, identity, existence and action; one that is not essential or timeless, but is thoroughly historical and contingent, that is deployed and mobilised in a fraught and conflictual socio-political context of some kind. In short, ontology is the 'politics of truth'18 in its most sweeping and powerful form. I see such a drive for ontological certainty and completion as particularly problematic for a number of reasons. Firstly, when it takes the form of the existential and rationalist ontologies of war, it amounts to a hard and exclusivist claim: a drive for ideational hegemony and closure that limits debate and questioning, that confines it within the boundaries of a particular, closed system of logic, one that is grounded in the truth of being, in the truth of truth as such. The second is its intimate relation with violence: the dual ontologies represent a simultaneously social and conceptual structure that generates violence. Here we are witness to an epistemology of violence (strategy) joined to an ontology of violence (the national security state). When we consider their relation to war, the two ontologies are especially dangerous because each alone (and doubly in combination) tends both to quicken the resort to war and to lead to its escalation either in scale and duration, or in unintended effects. In such a context violence is not so much a tool that can be picked up and used on occasion, at limited cost and with limited impact -- it permeates being. This essay describes firstly the ontology of the national security state (by way of the political philosophy of Thomas Hobbes, Carl Schmitt and G. W. F. Hegel) and secondly the rationalist ontology of strategy (by way of the geopolitical thought of Henry Kissinger), showing how they crystallise into a mutually reinforcing system of support and justification, especially in the thought of Clausewitz. This creates both a profound ethical and pragmatic problem. The ethical problem arises because of their militaristic force -- they embody and reinforce a norm of war -- and because they enact what Martin Heidegger calls an 'enframing' image of technology and being in which humans are merely utilitarian instruments for use, control and destruction, and force -- in the words of one famous Cold War strategist -- can be thought of as a 'power to hurt'.19 The pragmatic problem arises because force so often produces neither the linear system of effects imagined in strategic theory nor anything we could meaningfully call security, but rather turns in upon itself in a nihilistic spiral of pain and destruction. In the era of a 'war on terror' dominantly conceived in Schmittian and Clausewitzian terms,20 the arguments of Hannah Arendt (that violence collapses ends into means) and Emmanuel Levinas (that 'every war employs arms that turn against those that wield them') take on added significance. Neither, however, explored what occurs when war and being are made to coincide, other than Levinas' intriguing comment that in war persons 'play roles in which they no longer recognises themselves, making them betray not only commitments but their own substance'. 21 What I am trying to describe in this essay is a complex relation between, and interweaving of, epistemology and ontology. But it is not my view that these are distinct modes of knowledge or levels of truth, because in the social field named by security, statecraft and violence they are made to blur together, continually referring back on each other, like charges darting between electrodes. Rather they are related systems of knowledge with particular systemic roles and intensities of claim about truth, political being and political necessity. Positivistic or scientific claims to epistemological truth supply an air of predictability and reliability to policy and political action, which in turn support larger ontological claims to national being and purpose, drawing them into a common horizon of certainty that is one of the central features of past-Cartesian modernity. Here it may be useful to see ontology as a more totalising and metaphysical set of claims about truth, and epistemology as more pragmatic and instrumental; but while a distinction between epistemology (knowledge as technique) and ontology (knowledge as being) has analytical value, it tends to break down in action. The epistemology of violence I describe here (strategic science and foreign policy doctrine) claims positivistic clarity about techniques of military and geopolitical action which use force and coercion to achieve a desired end, an end that is supplied by the ontological claim to national existence, security, or order. However in practice, technique quickly passes into ontology. This it does in two ways. First, instrumental violence is married to an ontology of insecure national existence which itself admits no questioning. The nation and its identity are known and essential, prior to any conflict, and the resort to violence becomes an equally essential predicate of its perpetuation. In this way knowledge-as-strategy claims, in a positivistic fashion, to achieve a calculability of effects (power) for an ultimate purpose (securing being) that it must always assume. Second, strategy as a technique not merely becomes an instrument of state power but ontologises itself in a technological image of 'man' as a maker and user of things, including other humans, which have no essence or integrity outside their value as objects. In Heidegger's terms, technology becomes being; epistemology immediately becomes technique, immediately being. This combination could be seen in the aftermath of the 2006 Lebanon war, whose obvious strategic failure for Israelis generated fierce attacks on the army and political leadership and forced the resignation of the IDF chief of staff. Yet in its wake neither ontology was rethought. Consider how a reserve soldier, while on brigade-sized manoeuvres in the Golan Heights in early 2007, was quoted as saying: 'we are ready for the next war'. Uri Avnery quoted Israeli commentators explaining the rationale for such a war as being to 'eradicate the shame and restore to the army the "deterrent power" that was lost on the battlefields of that unfortunate war'. In 'Israeli public discourse', he remarked, 'the next war is seen as a natural phenomenon, like tomorrow's sunrise.' The danger obviously raised here is that these dual ontologies of war link being, means, events and decisions into a single, unbroken chain whose very process of construction cannot be examined. As is clear in the work of Carl Schmitt, being implies action, the action that is war. This chain is also obviously at work in the U.S. neoconservative doctrine that argues, as Bush did in his 2002 West Point speech, that 'the only path to safety is the path of action', which begs the question of whether strategic practice and theory can be detached from strong ontologies of the insecure nation-state. This is the direction taken by much realist analysis critical of Israel and the Bush administration's 'war on terror' Reframing such concerns in Foucauldian terms, we could argue that obsessive ontological commitments have led to especially disturbing 'problematizations' of truth. However such rationalist critiques rely on a one-sided interpretation of Clausewitz that seeks to disentangle strategic from existential reason, and to open up choice in that way. However without interrogating more deeply how they form a conceptual harmony in Clausewitz's thought -- and thus in our dominant understandings of politics and war -- tragically violent 'choices' will continue to be made The essay concludes by pondering a normative problem that arises out of its analysis: if the divisive ontology of the national security state and the violent and instrumental vision of 'enframing' have, as Heidegger suggests, come to define being and drive 'out every other possibility of revealing being', how can they be escaped? How can other choices and alternatives be found and enacted? How is there any scope for agency and resistance in the face of them? Their social and discursive power -- one that aims to take up the entire space of the political -- needs to be respected and understood. However, we are far from powerless in the face of them. The need is to critique dominant images of political being and dominant ways of securing that being at the same time, and to act and choose such that we bring into the world a more sustainable, peaceful and non-violent global rule of the political.

#### Vote neg to overdetermine the ontological by exposing the contradictions of imperial knowledge production – this dissident act fractures hegemonic thought

Spanos 8 (William Spanos, professor of English and comparative literature at Binghamton University, 2008, “American Exceptionalism in the Age of Globalization: The Specter of Vietnam,” pp 27-30)

On the other hand, I do not want to suggest that the theoretical perspective of Heidegger’s Abgeschiedene as such (or, for that matter, its poststructuralist allotropes) is entirely adequate to this task of resistance either, since the consequences of his (and, in a different way, of those he influenced) failure to adequately think the political imperatives of his interrogation of Western ontology are now painfully clear. We must, rather, think the Abgeschiedene—the “ghostly” ontological exile evolving a way of “errant” thinking that would be able to resist the global imperialism of Occidental/technological logic—with, say, Said’s political Deleuzian nomad: the displaced political emigré evolving, by way of his or her refusal to be answerable to the “Truth” of the Occident, a politics capable of resisting the polyvalent global neo-imperialism of Occidental political power. The Abgeschiedene, the displaced thinker, and the migrant, the displaced political person, are not incommensurable entities; they are two indissolubly related, however uneven, manifestations of the same world-historical event. The “political Left” of the 1980s, which inaugurated the momentum “against theory,” was entirely justified in accusing the “theoretical” discourse of the 1970s of an ontological and/or textual focus that, in its obsessive systematics, rendered it, in Said’s word, “unworldly”—indifferent to the “imperial” politics of historically specific Western history. But it can be seen now, in the wake of the representation of the global “triumph” of liberal democratic capitalism in the 1990s as the end of history, or, at any rate, of America’s arrogant will to impose capitalist-style democracy on different, “destabilizing” cultures, that this Left’s focus on historically specific politics betrays a disabling indifference to the polyvalent imperial politics of ontological representation. It thus repeats in reverse the essential failure of the theoretically oriented discourse it has displaced. This alleged praxisoriented discourse, that is, tends—even as it unconsciously employs in its critique the ontologically produced “white” metaphorics and rhetoric informing the practices it opposes—to separate praxis from and to privilege it over theory, the political over the ontological. Which is to say, it continues, in tendency, to understand being in the arbitrary—and disabling— disciplinary terms endemic to and demanded by the very panoptic classificatory logic of modern technological thinking, the advanced metaphysical logic that perfected, if it did not exactly enable, the colonial project proper.35 In so doing, this praxis-oriented discourse fails to perceive that being, however it is represented, constitutes a continuum, which, though unevenly developed at any historically specific moment, nevertheless traverses its indissolubly related “sites” from being as such and the epistemological subject through the ecos, culture (including family, class, gender, and race), to sociopolitics (including the nation and the international or global sphere). As a necessary result, it fails to perceive the emancipatory political potential inhering in the relay of “differences” released (decolonized) by an interrogation of the dominant Western culture’s disciplinary representation of being. By this relay of positively potential differences I do not simply mean “the nothing” (das Nichts) or “the ontological difference” (Heidegger), “existence” (Sartre), “the absolutely other” (Levinas), “the differance” or “trace” (Derrida), “the differend” (Lyotard), the “invisible” or “absent cause” (Althusser) that belong contradictorily to and haunt “white”/totalitarian metaphysical thinking.36 I also mean “the pariah” (Arendt), “the nomad” (Deleuze and Guattari), “the hybrid” or “the minus in the origin” (Bhabha), “the nonbeings” (Dussel), the subaltern (Guha), “the emigré” (Said), “the denizen” (Hammar), “the refugee” (Agamben), “the queer” (Sedgwick, Butler, Warner), “the multitude” (Negri and Hardt),37 and, to point to the otherwise unlikely affiliation of these international post“colonial” thinkers with a certain strain of post“modern” black American literature, “the darkness” (Morrison) that belong contradictorily to and haunt “white”/imperial culture politics: The images of impenetrable whiteness need contextualizing to explain their extraordinary power, pattern, and consistency. Because they appear almost always in conjunction with representations of black or Africanist people who are dead, impotent, or under complete control, these images of blinding whiteness seem to function as both antidote for meditation on the shadow that is the companion to this whiteness—a dark and abiding presence that moves the hearts and texts of American literature with fear and longing. This haunting, a darkness from which our early literature seemed unable to extricate itself, suggests the complex and contradictory situation in which American writers found themselves during the formative years of the nation’s literature.38 In this chapter, I have overdetermined the ontological perspective of the Abgeschiedene, the errant thinker in the interregnum who would think the spectral “nothing” that a triumphant empirical science “wishes to know nothing” about,39 not simply, however, for the sake of rethinking the question of being as such, but also to instigate a rethinking of the uneven relay of practical historical imperatives precipitated by the post-Cold War occasion. My purpose, in other words, has been to make visible and operational the substantial and increasingly complex practical role that ontological representation has played and continues to play in the West’s perennial global imperial project, a historical role rendered disablingly invisible as a consequence of the oversight inherent in the vestigially disciplinary problematics of the privileged oppositional praxis-oriented discourses, including that of all too many New Americanists. In accordance with this need to reintegrate theory and practice—the ontological and the sociopolitical, thinking and doing—and to accommodate the present uneven balance of this relationship to the actual conditions established by the total colonization of thinking in the age of the world picture, I would suggest, in a prologemenal way, the inordinate urgency of resuming the virtually abandoned destructive genealogy of the truth discourse of the post-Enlightenment Occident, now, however, reconstellated into the post-Cold War conjuncture. I mean specifically, the conjuncture that, according to Fukuyama (and the strategically less explicit Straussian neoconservatives that have risen to power in America after 9/11), has borne apocalyptic witness to the global triumph of liberal capitalist democracy and the end of history. Such a reconstellated genealogy, as I have suggested, will show that this “triumphant” post-Cold War American polity constitutes the fulfillment (end) of the last (anthropological) phase of a continuous, historically produced, three part ontological/cultural/sociopolitical Western history: what Heidegger, to demarcate its historical itinerary (Greco-Roman, Medieval/Protestant Christian, and Enlightenment liberal humanist), has called the “ontotheological tradition.” It will also show that this long and various history, which the neoconservatives would obliterate, has been from its origins imperial in essence. I am referring to the repeatedly reconstructed history inaugurated by the late or post- Socratic Greeks or, far more decisively, by the Romans, when they reduced the pre-Socratic truth as a-letheia (unconcealment) to veritas (the adequation of mind and thing), when, that is, they reified (essentialized) the tentative disclosures of a still originative Platonic and Aristotelian thinking and harnessed them as finalized, derivative conceptional categories to the ideological project of legitimizing, extending, and efficiently administering the Roman Empire in the name of the Pax Romana.

#### Every affirmation is a decision and an affirmation of a particular interpretation of what it means to decide – neutralizing that moment before a decision is in of itself violent

**Dillon 99** (Michael Dillon, professor of international relations at the University of Lancaster, PhD in philosophy, April 1999, “Another Justice,” published in Political Theory Volume 27 Number 2, page 157-8)

I wish to argue, in addition, that the condition of being-in-between is exemplified by the 'inter' of another international relations. Especially in the proximity of the Refugee, for example, there is an explicit manifestation of the advent of the claim of Justice. The traditional intersubjectivity of international relations defaults, through the way in which the advent of the Refugee always calls to presence the stranger in the self itself, into the intra of a plural and divided self. The figure of the sovereign subject so integral to traditional international thought falsely poses the key questions of the self, of origination and of Justice. There can be no sovereign point of departure. The law is always born from a broken law, justice from the absence of Justice. There is always a co-presence of the other in the same; such that every self is a hybrid. The origin, if it is to issue forth in anything, therefore, must always already come divided and incomplete. The advent of Justice and the possibility of politics arise only because that plethos is ineradicable. There is then no sovereign subject. The self is a divided self from a beginning that is itself incomplete. It is only by virtue of that very division, that very incompleteness, that the question of justice arises at all. Thought of another Justice is therefore a continuous displacement of normal justice, a radical discomfort to it. But I have first to note how normal justice understands its place before considering the taking place of Justice differently. At its simplest the normal model of justice-sometimes known as the distributive model-notes that any society is governed by rules.9 Normal models differ, however, according to how they account for the derivation of those rules, what those rules define as just and unjust, and who or what is empowered by them to make, execute, and interpret the law. The most basic of these rules establish the status and entitlements of those who belong to the community. Correspondingly, these rules also specify who is a stranger, outsider, or alien, and they sometimes make provision for how the alien is to be dealt with should she or he appear at, or cross, the threshold of the community. This, in its crudest terms, is distributive justice. The laws, which it specifies, establish a regime of justice that expresses the ethical beliefs and commitments of that community. More than that, they inaugurate them. Each juridical decision is in some way, great or small, a communal rededication of those beliefs. The law, then, does not merely make a decision or enact a will. It reinaugurates a sense of what it is to have a will and make a decision in that community, as well as to what ends and purposes these may be devoted.10 Such law has to come from somewhere. An official narrative of one form or another supports how the community came to have the law which it does, together with the means and manner by which it is to be interpreted and exercised. That narrative explains both the origins of the law and the way in which it has been handed down. God and covenants, immemorial traditions and social contracts are amongst the most favoured of these. Divine inspiration, the dictates of reason, or a common sense are then said to furnish the law with the secure foundation it is thought to require. Injustice for the normal model, it further follows, is a function of sin, or the breakdown of reason, or the failure to attend to the dictates of common sense. One way or another, each of these ruptures tends to be blamed upon the irruption of irregular passions and desires which the law was inaugurated to limit and control as the means of determining and dispensing justice in the first place. Injustice for the normal model, in short, is the abnormal which effects a breach in the very paternity of the law itself. It is what the normal model claims to keep at bay as distributive justice orders the affairs of the community. All thought of justice and politics must, of course, pass through thought. How could it be otherwise? We think justice in the way that we do because of the various forms through which it is established and distributed. We also think justice in the way that we do because of the way that we think. The thought of another Justice is necessarily dependent therefore upon a way of thinking other than that which has historically come to govern our diverse onto-theological traditions of justice. That other way of thinking has continuously to be contrasted with the thought that underlies distributive justice, so that the characteristic features of another Justice may be differentiated from those of the normal model. Two of the key points of difference concern the interpretation of Time and the interpretation of the Human. Each of these derives from what I call the return of the ontological in continental thought.

### Manufacturing

#### Their first card concludes investment in infrastructure is unnecessary and that internal strategic efforts are key which the aff doesn’t do

Wilson and Lee 12 (Christopher E. Wilson is an Associate at the Wilson Center’s Mexico Institute, Erik Lee serves as Associate Director at the North American Center for Transborder Studies (NACTS) at Arizona State University, July 2012, "Whole Nations Waiting Trade sets records, but congestion threatens competitiveness." http://www.siteselection.com/issues/2012/jul/us-mex-border.cfm)

Lexington’s card begins

Commerce between the United States and Mexico is one of the great — yet underappreciated — success stories of the global economy. In 2011 U.S.-Mexico goods and services trade reached the major milestone of one-half trillion dollars with virtually no recognition. The United States is Mexico's top trading partner, and Mexico — which has gained macroeconomic stability and expanded its middle class over the last two decades — is the United States' second largest export market and third largest trading partner.

Seventy percent of bilateral commerce crosses the border via trucks, meaning the border region is literally where "the rubber hits the road" for bilateral relations. This also means that not only California and Baja California, but also Michigan and Michoacán, all have a major stake in efficient and secure border management.

The quantity of U.S.-Mexico trade is impressive, but its quality makes it unique. The United States and Mexico do not just sell goods to one another, they actually work together to manufacture them. Through production sharing, materials and parts often cross back and forth between factories on each side of the border as a final product is made and assembled. As a result, U.S. imports from Mexico contain, on average, 40 percent U.S. content, and Mexico's imports from the U.S. also have a high level of Mexican content.

This system of joint production has two important consequences. First, it means that our economies are profoundly linked. We tend to experience growth and recession together, and productivity gains or losses on one side of the border generally cause a corresponding gain or loss in competitiveness on the other side as well. Second, the fact that goods often cross the border several times as they are being produced creates a multiplier effect for gains and losses in border efficiency. Whereas goods from China only go through customs and inspection once as they enter the U.S. or Mexico, products built by regional manufacturers bear the costs of long and unpredictable border wait times and significant customs requirements each time they cross the U.S.-Mexico border.

Corridors in Crisis

This trade relationship requires major infrastructure to function effectively. The largest trade corridor, often referred to as the NASCO corridor, links central and eastern Mexico to Texas, the American Midwest, Northeast, and Ontario, utilizing the key Laredo-Nuevo Laredo ports of entry (POEs). Other important trade arteries include the CANAMEX Corridor, which connects western Mexico to the intermountain United States and Canadian province of Alberta, as well as the shorter but high-volume I-5 corridor connecting California to Baja California. As the economies of both the U.S. and Mexico grow, it is likely that this network of freight transportation infrastructure — and the land POEs that serve as nodes in this network — will experience added stress.

Unfortunately, the infrastructure and capacity of the ports of entry to process goods and individuals entering the United States has not kept pace with the expansion of bilateral trade or the population growth of the border region. Instead, the need for greater border security following the terrorist attacks of 9/11 led to a thickening of the border, dividing the twin cities that characterize the region and adding costly, long and unpredictable wait times for commercial and personal crossers alike. Congestion acts as a drag on the competitiveness of the region and of the United States and Mexico in their entirety. Solutions are needed that strengthen both border security and efficiency at the same time.

The integrated nature of the North American manufacturing sector makes eliminating border congestion an important way to enhance regional competitiveness. The global economic crisis forced manufacturers to look for ways to cut costs. After taking into consideration factors such as rising fuel costs, increasing wages in China and the ability to automate an ever greater portion of the production process, many American companies decided to nearshore factories to Mexico or reshore them to the United States, taking advantage of strong human capital and shorter supply chains. Bilateral trade dropped significantly during the recession but has since rebounded strongly, growing significantly faster than trade with China.

But the growth of trade continues to add pressure on the already strained POEs and transportation corridors. Several studies have attempted to quantify the costs of border area congestion to the economies of the United States and Mexico. In what is perhaps a testimony to the fragmented and geographically disperse nature of the border region, most of these studies have focused on particular North-South corridors of traffic and trade rather than taking a comprehensive, border-wide approach. The specific results of the studies (see table on p. 108) are quite varied. Nonetheless, one message comes through quite clearly — long and unpredictable wait times at the POEs are costing the United States and Mexican economies many billions of dollars each year.

Lexington’s card ends

Moderate investments to update infrastructure and to fully staff the ports of entry are certainly needed, as long lines and overworked staff promote neither efficiency nor security. **But in a time of tight federal budgets, asking for more resources cannot be the only answer**. Strategic efforts that do more with less, improving efficiency and reducing congestion, **are also needed**. Trusted traveler and shipper programs (i.e. the Global Entry programs, which includes programs such as SENTRI, FAST, C-TPAT) allow vetted, low-risk individuals and shipments expedited passage across the border.

#### Your advantage is so 2012 – manufacturing is skyrocketing

Beschloss, 1/11 (Morris Beschloss, citing the Global Industrial Outlook by Industrial Info Resources and the ADP monthly analysis, “2014 Manufacturing/Construction Off to a Running Start,” http://voices.mydesert.com/2014/01/11/2014-industrial-manufacturingconstruction-off-to-running-start/) gz

Two simultaneous revelations right after the first of the year have magnified our predictions of industrial manufacturing and construction expansion, as the first quarter of 2014 gets off and running:¶ 1) The ADP monthly analysis of December employment revealed 48,000 new construction and 19,000 new manufacturing jobs posted. These numbers **exceed any pluses** in these sectors **since the end of the “great recession**,” and likely **since the first of the new millennium**.¶ 2) According to “2014 Global Industrial Outlook,” published by Industrial Info Resources, the U.S. industrial manufacturing sector is expected to initiate **a record $10 billion** in construction starts in the first quarter of 2014. Also indicated by Industrial Info Resources are **254 capital and maintenance manufacturing industry projects** that are worth **an estimated $9.94 billion**, already in their initial stages.¶ While the revamped **automotive manufacturing sector** has been the **surprise success story** in the wake of the great recession, **the broad spectrum of transportation** is expected to jump out in front as both pipeline infrastructure for oil and gas, as well as upgrading of an out-dated electric distribution system will at least lay the groundwork for ongoing development this year.¶ Even general heavy industrial manufacturing will see some significant spending during the first quarter of 2014, as **major sub-sectors** such as the chemical industry **move foreign-based facilities back to the U.S.,** driven by the availability of cheap natural gas, which is fundamental to the development of the myriad derivatives emanating from this major industrial sector.¶ It is estimated by “Industrial Info Resources” that record spending will reach its peak during the second and third quarters of this year, which should eventually set the stage for an **even stronger 2015**.¶ While the re-birth of multi-faceted transportation/continuation of “fracking” energy development, and the revival of U.S. based heavy industrial manufacturing will get little support from federal governmental agencies, there will likely be less opposition from the **E**nvironmental **P**rotection **A**gency and other federal regulators, restrained by the politics of the 2014 mid-term elections.¶ While no specific action will be taken to reduce unemployment, the very intensity of new construction, as well as industrial, commercial and residential maintenance and repair activities will likely bring the Labor Department’s unemployment index down below 7%. Even the more accurate labor participation performance index is expected to jump off its 63% plus base, where it rests today.

#### Zero chance of Taiwan war – China’s cooperating with them – most recent evidence

Jiao and Wanli, 13

Wu Jiao and Yang Wanli, reporters for China Daily, citing Ni Yongjie, deputy director of the Shanghai Institute of Taiwan Studies, AND Wang Yingjin, professor at the School of International Studies of Renmin University of China, AND Vincent Siew, honourary chairman of the Taiwan-based Cross-Straits Common Market Foundation, AND Zhang Zhijun, the mainland’s Taiwan affairs top official, AND Xi Jinping, current leader of China; “Direction charted to resolve disputes,” 10/6/2013, http://usa.chinadaily.com.cn/china/2013-10/06/content\_17011582.htm //bghs-ms

Political disputes between the Chinese mainland and Taiwan could be gradually and eventually resolved, Party chief Xi Jinping said on Sunday.¶ He made the remarks while meeting Vincent Siew, honourary chairman of the Taiwan-based Cross-Straits Common Market Foundation, ahead of the 21st informal economic leaders’ meeting of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum on the Indonesian resort island of Bali.¶ "We cannot hand those problems down from generation to generation," Xi said.¶ The concept that "both sides of the Straits are of one family" should be advocated, Xi said, adding that the two sides should strengthen communication and cooperation and jointly work for the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation.¶ During the 40-minute meeting, Xi said that it is important for the mainland and Taiwan to seize the historic opportunities to keep up the good momentum of the peaceful development of cross-Straits relations.¶ Xi noted that enhancing cross-Straits political trust and consolidating a common political basis are "crucial" to ensuring peaceful development of cross-Straits ties.¶ "We should set our sights on the future," Xi said.¶ He advised that the principals of departments-in-charge from the two sides may meet and exchange ideas for cross-Straits affairs.¶ Siew hailed the development of cross-Straits relations over the past five years, saying Taiwan and the mainland should expand economic and trade cooperation.¶ It was the second meeting between the two since March. Their first meeting took place on the sidelines of the Boao Forum for Asia held in Hainan province in April.¶ **Experts** said they believe the talks between Xi and Siew were a positive sign for both sides to strengthen trade ties, which will pave the way for deepening political and cultural exchanges.¶ "As a representative of (Taiwan leader) Ma Ying-jeou, Siew, to some extent, conveys messages from Ma. **The talks will lay a good foundation to solve differences between the two** sides," said Ni Yongjie, deputy director of the Shanghai Institute of Taiwan Studies.¶ "Xi’s words on solving problems that exist between the two sides, step by step, show hope that the two sides could reach a consensus on certain issues soon," Ni said.¶ Siew, a former Taiwan senior official, has participated in the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum twice since the 1990s. He was nicknamed by Ma Ying-jeou as Taiwan’s "chief economic designer" due to his strategic thoughts on trade and business.¶ Wang Yingjin, professor at the School of International Studies of Renmin University of China, said that Siew’s experience on business and politics will contribute to further economic cooperation between the two sides.¶ "The concept of a co-market of the mainland and Taiwan was proposed by Siew. He is a good delegate to talk with the mainland on business," he said.¶ Although not all problems could be solved overnight, he said, the two sides should not avoid facing them. "Working together to tackle the problems is the right way."¶ Shortly after the meeting, Zhang Zhijun, the mainland’s Taiwan affairs top official, chatted with Wang Yu-chi, Taiwan’s official in charge of mainland affairs. Both participated in Xi’s meeting with Siew.¶ Wang proposed that they should realise mutual visits, which Zhang agreed to, according to a press release by the mainland’s Taiwan Affairs Office.¶ Zhang said he welcomed Wang visiting the mainland "at the proper time".¶ According to a cross-Straits service trade agreement that was signed in June, the Chinese mainland will open 80 service sectors to Taiwan, while, in response, Taiwan will open 64 sectors.¶ It is one of several follow-up agreements to the Economic Cooperation Framework Agreement, a comprehensive cross-Straits economic pact signed in 2010.¶ Experts said that the two sides could deepen exchanges in wholesaling, retailing, finance, telecommunications and healthcare, as the mainland moves to upgrade its economy.¶ According to the Taiwan Affairs Office of the State Council, cross-Straits trade reached a historic high of US$168.96 billion in 2012, and the mainland’s investment in Taiwan increased 10-fold compared with 2011.¶ In 2012, more than 2,000 projects, with a total investment of $2.8 billion from Taiwan, were permitted to operate in the mainland.

#### No nuclear escalation and outside powers will stay out

Roger **Cliff,** Ph.D. in international relations, Princeton, M.A. in history (Chinese studies), University of California, San Diego, Assistant for Strategy Development, Office of the Secretary of Defense, and David A. **Shlapak**, Ph.D., senior international policy analyst, RAND Project Air Force Report, 200**7**

This situation would occur if China attempted to use force to achieve unification, the United States intervened, and China’s efforts were defeated, but Beijing refused to accept Taiwan’s independence.10 Analysis at RAND has found that a conflict between the United States and China over Taiwan would likely be confined to the use of conventional weapons, even though both the United States and China possess nuclear weapons, and that it would not likely escalate into a broader war between the United States and China. That is, the war would be contained in the area around Taiwan; the main combatants would probably be limited to the United States, China, and Japan; and active hostilities would probably end after a relatively short time. Nonetheless, such a war would probably result in a bitter relationship between the United States and China, comparable in some ways to that between the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War. China might well accelerate the buildup of its military capabilities with an eye toward waging a second, this time successful, campaign to claim Taiwan. This military competition would likely also be accompanied by a broader deterioration in Sino-U.S. relations, with mutual trade and investment falling dramatically or even ceasing, and each country demanding that its allies not cooperate with its rival. Countries in Asia might find themselves under pressure to choose between good relations with the United States and good relations with China. Nonetheless, even under these circumstances, the relationship between the United States and China after an inconclusive war over Taiwan would have important differences from the one between the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War. Unlike the Soviet Union, China is closely integrated into the world economy. With the exception of Japan, most countries in Asia would likely regard the importance of maintaining good relations with Beijing as outweighing any concerns about China having used force against Taiwan. They would resist U.S. pressure to choose between Washington and Beijing, preferring to maintain good relations with both. This logic would apply even more strongly to countries outside the region, which would be even less concerned about China’s use of force.

#### Deterrence theory is wrong

Wilson 8 (Ward Wilson, senior fellow at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, director of the Rethinking Nuclear Weapons Project, November 2008, “The Myth of Nuclear Deterrence,” published in the *Nonproliferation Review* Volume 15 Number 3, <http://cns.miis.edu/npr/pdfs/153_wilson.pdf>) gz

Some people try to make the case for nuclear deterrence not by explaining its theoretical¶ basis but by simply pointing to its track record. They assert that nuclear deterrence¶ prevented nuclear attacks for the thirty years from 1950 to 1980 and claim that that is¶ proof enough of its efficacy. There are problems with this, however. In order to answer the¶ question, ‘‘did deterrence work?’’ you must first be able to know whether your opponent¶ had a fully formed intention to attack and then refrained from doing so because of your¶ threat. Questions of intention, particularly the intention of world leaders\*who are¶ typically reluctant to admit being thwarted in almost any circumstances\***are rarely¶ documented**, and when documentary evidence is present, **difficult to judge**. As George¶ and Smoke note, ‘‘It is difficult . . . to identify cases of deterrence success reliably in¶ the absence of better data on the policy calculations of potential initiators who were¶ presumably deterred. Instances of apparently successful deterrence . . . may be spurious.’’¶ 39¶ There are also **a number of other plausible explanations** for the absence of war¶ during this period. Most major wars are followed by periods, sometimes quite long¶ periods, of relative peace. The hundred years following the Napoleonic wars were for the¶ most part ones of peace in Europe. The period following the Thirty Years War also was¶ strikingly pacific. Why does it make sense to attribute the peace following the Thirty Years¶ War and the Napoleonic Wars to ‘‘war weariness,’’ ‘‘economic exhaustion,’’ or ‘‘domestic¶ political distraction,’’ but the peace after World War II to nuclear deterrence?¶ Consider, for example, the case of chemical weapons following World War I. The¶ conditions necessary for deterrence with these weapons of mass destruction were present.¶ In the early 1920s, Germany, England, France, Italy, Russia, the United States, and others¶ possessed the means necessary (industrial capacity to mass produce the chemical agents,¶ bombers with sufficient range and carrying capacity, naval ships capable of firing large¶ shells over long ranges) to use chemical weapons against the densely populated coastal¶ and interior urban centers of their enemies.40 Such attacks, properly planned and¶ executed, could have killed hundreds of thousands. They would certainly have ranked on a¶ par with the most deadly city attacks in World War II.¶ Yet no standard histories of the post-World War I era ascribe the peace that was¶ maintained during those years to a ‘‘delicate balance’’ of deadly weapons of mass¶ destruction. We do not rush to give deterrence the credit for the peace of those years. If¶ nuclear weapons are seen as preventing war from 1950 to 1980, why is it that chemical¶ weapons are not seen as having prevented war for the seven years from 1918 to 1925?41¶ Locating the reason why an action or phenomenon did not occur, finding the cause¶ of an absence, is **always problematic**. For example, I believe firmly that the garlic I wear¶ around my neck has prevented vampire attacks. The proof, I say, is that no vampires have,¶ as yet, attacked me. Yet objective observers might still be skeptical.¶ The problem with the claim about deterrence is that although there were¶ contingency plans on both sides, there is **little evidence** that either the United States or¶ the Soviet Union was ever on the brink of launching an aggressive war against the other.¶ There is **certainly no evidence** of such an action that was planned, agreed to, and then¶ thwarted by the threat of nuclear counterattack.42 How is it possible to assert that¶ deterrence prevented war without clear evidence that war was ever imminent?¶ It might be argued that while there is no particular war that was abandoned because¶ of deterrence, deterrence did engender a general mutual restraint both in normal¶ diplomatic relations and during the numerous crises of the Cold War. It is true that the¶ large nuclear arsenals in the United States and the Soviet Union induced caution during¶ this period. Numerous memoirs of leaders on both sides attest to this fact. But this is **not¶ evidence** that deterrence worked.¶ The mutual caution of the Cold War is evidence that nuclear weapons are dangerous,¶ not that they are effective weapons of war or useful for threatening. To understand this,¶ imagine a counterfactual involving biological weapons. No one argues that biological¶ weapons are ideal weapons. They are blunt instruments, clumsy and difficult to employ¶ effectively. Targeting with precision is a particular problem, as the wind has an unfortunate¶ tendency to blow in unexpected directions, and the biological agents can, under certain¶ circumstances, blow back on your own troops or population. No one argues that¶ biological weapons are decisive weapons of war, crucial for security. They argue instead¶ that biological weapons are dangerous, clumsy weapons that are best banned.¶ Imagine, however, that following World War II the United States and Soviet Union¶ had been armed with large arsenals of biological weapons mounted on missiles kept on¶ hair-trigger alert. Is it difficult to believe that such arsenals would have induced caution on¶ both sides? Yet we would not take this caution as proof that biological weapons were any¶ less clumsy, difficult to aim, or difficult to control. We would not take this caution as proof¶ that biological weapons are actually more militarily effective than we had previously¶ thought. In the same way, nuclear weapons are dangerous (and induce caution) without¶ being particularly effective. The caution on both sides during the Cold War is not proof of¶ the deterrent value of nuclear weapons.¶ Although the successes of nuclear deterrence over the thirty years from 1950 to¶ 1980 are speculative, its failures are not. Despite expectations to the contrary, the U.S.¶ nuclear monopoly in the four years after World War II **did not yield significantly greater¶ diplomatic influence**.43 Far from being cowed, the Soviets were very tough in post-war¶ negotiations, culminating in the 1948 showdown over access to Berlin. Nuclear weapons¶ also failed to give their possessors a decisive military advantage in war. The United States¶ was fought to a draw in Korea and subsequently lost a war fought in Vietnam, despite¶ possessing the ‘‘ultimate weapon.’’ The Soviet Union found that its nuclear arsenal could¶ not prevent failure in its own guerrilla war in Afghanistan. Since Vietnam, the United States¶ has fought in the **Persian Gulf, Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Iraq**.44 In none of these wars were¶ its opponents intimidated into surrendering, nor could a practical use for nuclear weapons¶ be devised.¶ Against these failures are often offered a range of explanations. The enemy had an¶ ally who possessed nuclear weapons, the war was not sufficiently central to the interests of¶ the nuclear power to justify using weapons of last resort, and so on. These explanations,¶ however, cannot account for the striking failure of deterrence in both the Yom Kippur¶ War and the Falkland Islands War. Twice, during the Cold War, countries that had¶ nuclear weapons were attacked\*were made war on\*by nations that did not have¶ nuclear weapons. In both cases the threat of a nuclear retaliation **failed to deter**. How can¶ these failures be accounted for? One of the benefits of deterrence is that it is supposed to¶ protect against conventional assault. Yet in both these cases nuclear weapons failed to¶ provide this protection.¶ The case of Israel is particularly striking. Given the deep animus between Israel, on¶ the one hand, and Egypt and Syria, on the other, the repeated statements by various Arab¶ spokesmen that Israel had no right to exist, and the resulting probability that Israel would¶ interpret any attack as a threat to its very existence, the danger of a nuclear attack by Israel¶ would seem to be far greater than in any instance of Cold War confrontation. Yet **nuclear¶ weapons failed Israel**. **They did not deter**. In fact, they failed twice: neither Anwar Sadat,¶ the leader of Egypt, nor Hafez al-Assad, the leader of Syria, was deterred.45¶ There is positive evidence that nuclear threats do not prevent conventional attacks,¶ **even in circumstances where nuclear deterrence ought to work robustly** (extermination a¶ possibility, implacable foes). Similarly the evidence provides little support for the notion¶ that nuclear weapons provide diplomatic leverage. The only use for nuclear deterrence¶ with no clear-cut failures (thankfully) is the claim that nuclear deterrence wards off nuclear¶ attacks. Although the practical record does not indict this form of deterrence, the general¶ theoretical objections to it still apply.

#### Acts of sovereign violence due to the normalization of the state of emergency have made hegemony impossible forever for the United States – any exercise of US force in the future is only domination without hegemony that is doomed to fail

Gulli, 13 Bruno Gulli, professor of history, philosophy, and political science at Kingsborough College in New York, “For the critique of sovereignty and violence,” <http://academia.edu/2527260/For_the_Critique_of_Sovereignty_and_Violence>, pg. 5

I think that we have now an understanding of what the situation is: **The sovereign everywhere**, be it the political or financial elite, **fakes the legitimacy** on which its power and authority supposedly rest. In truth, they **rest on violence and terror**, or the threat thereof. This is an **obvious and essential aspect** of the singularity of the present crisis. In this sense, the singularity of the crisis lies in the fact that the struggle for dominance is at one and the same time impaired and made more brutal by **the lack of hegemony**. This is true in general, but it is perhaps particularly true with respect to the greatest power on earth, **the United States**, whose hegemony has **diminished or vanished**. It is a fortiori true of whatever is called ‘the West,’ of which the US has for about a century represented the vanguard. Lacking hegemony, the **sheer drive for domination** has to show **its true face**, its **raw violence**. The usual, traditional **ideological justifications for dominance** (such as bringing democracy and freedom here and there) have now become **very weak** because of **the contempt** that the dominant nations (the US and its most powerful allies) **regularly show** toward legality, morality, and humanity. Of course, the so-called rogue states, thriving on corruption, do not fare any better in this sense, but for them, when they act autonomously and against the dictates of ‘the West,’ the specter of punishment, in the form of retaliatory war or even indictment from the **I**nternational **C**riminal **C**ourt, remains a clear limit, a possibility. **Not so for the dominant nations**: who will stop the United States from striking anywhere at will, or Israel from regularly massacring people in the Gaza Strip, or envious France from once again trying its luck in Africa? Yet, though still dominant, these nations are painfully aware of their **structural, ontological and historical, weakness**. All attempts at concealing that weakness (and the uncomfortable awareness of it) **only heighten the brutality** in the exertion of **what remains of their dominance**. Although they rely on a **highly sophisticated military machine** (the technology of drones is a clear instance of this) and on an equally sophisticated diplomacy, which has **traditionally** been and **increasingly** is an outpost for **military operations and global policing** (now excellently **incarnated by Africom**), **they know that they have lost their hegemony**.

‘**Domination without hegemony’** is a phrase that Giovanni Arrighi uses in his study of the long twentieth century and his lineages of the twenty-first century (1994/2010 and 2007). Originating with Ranajit Guha (1992), the phrase captures the singularity of the global crisis, the terminal stage of sovereignty, in Arrighi’s “historical investigation of the present and of the future” (1994/2010: 221). It acquires particular meaning in the light of Arrighi’s notion of **the bifurcation of financial and military power.** Without getting into the question, treated by Arrighi, of the rise of China and East Asia, what I want to note is that for Arrighi, early in the twenty-first century, and certainly with the ill-advised and catastrophic war against Iraq, “the US belle époque came to an end and US world hegemony entered **what in all likelihood is its terminal crisis.”** He continues:

Although the United States remains by far the world’s most powerful state, its relationship to the rest of the world is now best described as one of **‘domination without hegemony’** (1994/2010: 384). What can the US do next? **Not much, short of brutal dominance**. In the last few years, we have seen president Obama praising himself for the killing of Osama bin Laden. While that action was most likely unlawful, too (Noam Chomsky has often noted that bin Laden was a suspect, not someone charged with or found guilty of a crime), it is certain that you can kill **all the bin Ladens of the world without gaining back a bit of hegemony**. In fact, this killing, just like G. W. Bush’s war against Iraq, makes one think of a **Mafia-style** regolamento di conti more than any other thing. Barack Obama is less forthcoming about the killing of 16-year-old Abdulrahman al-Awlaki, whose fate many have **correctly compared** to **that of** 17-year-old Trayvon Martin (killed in Florida by a self-appointed security watchman), but it is precisely in cases like this one that **the weakness at the heart of empire**, the ill-concealed and uncontrolled **fury for the loss of hegemony**, becomes visible. The frenzy denies the possibility of **power as care**, which is **what should replace hegemony**, let alone domination. Nor am I sure I share Arrighi’s optimistic view about the possible rise of a new hegemonic center of power in East Asia and China: probably that would only be a shift in the axis of uncaring power, unable to affect, let alone exit, the paradigm of sovereignty and violence. What is needed is rather **a radical alternative** in which power as domination, with or without hegemony, is replaced by power as care – in other words, **a poetic rather than military and financial shift.**

#### Air power this serves to construct a global police system that blurs the line between civilian and target—a failure to strategically reverse aerial power relations causes extinction

Neocleous 13—Department of Politics and History, Brunel University

(Mark, “Air power and police power”, Environment and Planning D: Society and Space 2013, volume 31, pages 578 – 593, dml)

Moreover, and more pressingly, we need to understand that from the wider historical perspective of air power **there are no civilian areas and there are no civilians**; **the only logic is a police logic**. As soon as air power was created the issue was: **what does this do to civilian space?** And, essentially, **the answer has been**: ‘**it destroys it’**. Air power thus likewise destroys the concept of the civilian. This was the major theme of the air power literature of the 1920s, found in the work of Mitchell, Seversky, Fuller, and all the others, but the analysis provided in The Command of the Air by Giulio Douhet, first published in 1921, expanded in 1927, and perhaps the first definitive account of the influence of air power on world history, is representative: the art of aerial warfare, notes Douhet, **is the art of destroying cities, of attacking civilians, of terrorising the population**. In the future, war “will be waged essentially **against the unarmed populations of the cities and great industrial centres**”. There are no longer soldiers and citizens, or combatants and noncombatants: “war is no longer a clash between armies, but **is a clash between nations, between whole populations**.” **Aerial bombing means war is now “total war”** (Douhet, 2003, pages 11; 158; 223). The major powers fought against accepting this for some time. (Or at least, fought against accepting it in their classic doctrine of war as a battle between militarily industrialised nation-states; the police bombing of colonies was entirely acceptable to them, as we have seen). But eventually, in the course of World War 2 they conceded, and by July 1945 a US Army assessment of strategic air power could openly state that “there are no civilians in Japan” (cited in Sherry, 1987, page 311). **This view has been maintained ever since**: “There are no innocent civilians”, says US General Curtis LeMay (cited in Sherry, 1987, page 287). Recent air power literature on ‘the enemy as a system’ continues this very line.(4) Hence, and contrary to claims made at both ends of the political spectrum that the recent air attacks in Beirut and Gaza reveal “the increasing meaninglessness of the word ‘civilian’ ” (Dershowitz, 2006) or mean that we might be “witnessing … the death of the idea of the civilian” (Gregory, 2006, page 633), it has to be said that **any meaningful concept of ‘the civilian’** **was destroyed with the very invention of air power** (Hartigan, 1982, page 119).(5)

The point is that seen from the perspective of air power as police power, **the use of drone technology over what some would still like to call ‘civilian spaces’ was highly predictable**. **This allows us to make a far more compelling argument about drones**. For like air power technology in general, **the drone serves as both plane and possibility** (Pandya, 2010, page 143). And what becomes possible with the drone **is permanent police presence across the territory**. “~~Unmanned~~ [unstaffed] aircraft have just revolutionized our ability to provide a constant stare against our enemy”, said a senior US military official. “Using the all-seeing eye, you will find out **who is important in a network, where they live, where they get their support from, where their friends are**” (cited in Barnes, 2009). Much as this might be important geopolitically, with drones being capable of maintaining nonstop surveillance of vast swathes of land and sea for so long as the technology and fuel supplies allow, it is also **nothing less than the state’s dream of a perpetual police presence across the territory** (Neocleous, 2000). And it is a police presence encapsulated by the process of colonisation, captured in the army document “StrikeStar 2025” which speaks of **the permanent presence of UAVs in the sky as a form of “air occupation”** (Carmichael et al, 1996, page viii).

Drones have been described as the perfect technology for democratic warfare, combining as they do a certain utilitarian character with an appealing ‘risk-transfer’ (Sauer and Schoring, 2012), but perhaps **we need to think of them equally** **as the perfect technology of liberal police**. When in 1943 Disney sought to popularise the idea of ‘victory through air power’, the company probably had little idea just quite what this victory might mean, beyond the defeat of Japan. But if there is a victory through air power to be had on the part of the state it is surely not merely the defeat of a military enemy but the victory of perpetual police.

#### Linearity fails in IR fails

Bernstein et al 2000 Steven Bernstein, Richard Ned Lebow, Janice Gross Stein and Steven Weber, University of Toronto, The Ohio State University, University of Toronto and University of California at Berkeley. “God Gave Physics the Easy Problems” European Journal of International Relations 2000; 6; 43

A deep irony is embedded in the history of the scientific study of international relations. Recent generations of scholars separated policy from theory to gain an intellectual distance from decision-making, in the belief that this would enhance the 'scientific' quality of their work. But five decades of well-funded efforts to develop theories of international relations have produced precious little in the way of useful, high confidence results. Theories abound, but few meet **the most relaxed** 'scientific' tests of validity. Even the most robust generalizations or laws we can state - war is more likely between neighboring states, weaker states are less likely to attack stronger states - **are close to trivial**, have important exceptions, and for the most part stand outside any consistent body of theory. A generation ago, we might have excused our performance on the grounds that we were a young science still in the process of defining problems, developing analytical tools and collecting data. This excuse is neither credible nor sufficient; there is no reason to suppose that another 50 years of well-funded research would result in anything resembling a valid theory in the Popperian sense. We suggest that **the nature, goals and criteria for judging social science theory should be rethought**, if theory is to be more helpful in understanding the real world. We begin by justifying our pessimism, both conceptually and empirically, and argue that the quest for *predictive* theory rests on a mistaken analogy between physical and social phenomena. Evolutionary biology is a more productive analogy for social science. We explore the value of this analogy in its 'hard' and 'soft' versions, and examine the implications of both for theory and research in international relations.2 We develop the case for forward 'tracking' of international relations on the basis of local and general knowledge as an alternative to backward-looking attempts to build deductive, nomothetic theory. We then apply this strategy to some emerging trends in international relations. This article is not a nihilistic diatribe against 'modern' conceptions of social science. Rather, it is a plea for constructive humility in the current context of attraction to deductive logic, falsifiable hypothesis and large-n statistical 'tests' of narrow propositions. We propose a practical alternative for social scientists to pursue in addition, and in a complementary fashion, to 'scientific' theory-testing. *Newtonian Physics: A Misleading Model* Physical and chemical laws make two kinds of predictions. Some phenomena - the trajectories of individual planets - can be predicted with a reasonable degree of certainty. Only a few variables need to be taken into account and they can be measured with precision. Other mechanical problems, like the break of balls on a pool table, while subject to deterministic laws, are inherendy unpredictable because of their complexity. Small differences in the lay of the table, the nap of the felt, the curvature of each ball and where they make contact, amplify the variance of each collision and lead to what appears as a near random distribution of balls. Most predictions in science are probabilistic, like the freezing point of liquids, the expansion rate of gases and all chemical reactions. Point predictions appear possible only because of the large numbers of units involved in interactions. In the case of nuclear decay or the expansion of gases, we are talking about *trillions* of atoms and molecules. In international relations, even more than in other domains of social science, it is often **impossible** to assign metrics to what we think are relevant variables (Coleman, 1964: especially Chapter 2). The concepts of **polarity**, relative power and the **balance of power** are among the most widely used independent variables, **but there are no commonly accepted definitions or measures** for them. Yet without consensus on definition and measurement, almost every statement or hypothesis will have too much wiggle room to be 'tested' decisively against evidence. What we take to be dependent variables fare little better. Unresolved controversies rage over the definition and evaluation of **deterrence outcomes**, and about the criteria for **democratic** **governance** and their application to specific countries at different points in their history. Differences in coding for even a few cases have significant implications for tests of theories of deterrence or of the democratic peace (Lebow and Stein, 1990; Chan, 1997). The lack of consensus about terms and their measurement is **not merely the result of** intellectual anarchy or **sloppiness** - although the latter cannot entirely be dismissed. Fundamentally, **it has more to do with the arbitrary nature of the concepts themselves.** Key terms in physics, like mass, temperature and velocity, refer to aspects of the physical universe that we cannot directly observe. However, they are embedded in theories with deductive implications that have been verified through empirical research. Propositions containing these terms are legitimate assertions about reality because their truth-value can be assessed. Social science theories are for the most part built on **'idealizations'**, that is, on concepts that cannot be anchored to observable phenomena through rules of correspondence. Most of these terms (e.g. rational actor, balance of power) are not descriptions of reality but **implicit 'theories'** about actors and **contexts that do not exist** (Hempel, 1952; Rudner, 1966; Gunnell, 1975; Moe, 1979; Searle, 1995: 68-72). The inevitable differences in interpretation of these concepts lead to different predictions in some contexts, and these outcomes may eventually produce widely varying futures (Taylor, 1985: 55). **If** problems of definition, measurement and coding could be resolved, we **would still find it** difficult, if not **impossible, to construct large enough samples** of comparable cases to permit statistical analysis. It is now almost generally accepted that in the analysis of the causes of wars, the **variation across time and the complexity of the interaction** among putative causes make the likelihood of a general theory **extraordinarily low**. Multivariate theories run into the problem of negative degrees of freedom, yet international relations rarely generates data sets in the high double digits. Where larger samples do exist, they often group together cases that differ from one another in theoretically important ways.3 Complexity in the form of multiple causation and equifinality can also make simple statistical comparisons misleading. But it is hard to elaborate more sophisticated statistical tests until one has a deeper baseline understanding of the nature of the phenomenon under investigation, as well as the categories and variables that make up candidate causes (Geddes, 1990: 131-50; Lustick, 1996: 505-18; Jervis, 1997). Wars - to continue with the same example - are similar to chemical and nuclear reactions in that they have underlying and immediate causes. **Even when all the underlying conditions are present**, these processes generally require a catalyst to begin. Chain reactions are triggered by the decay of atomic nuclei. Some of the neutrons they emit strike other nuclei prompting them to fission and emit more neutrons, which strike still more nuclei. Physicists can calculate how many kilograms of Uranium 235 or Plutonium at given pressures are necessary to produce a chain reaction. They can take it for granted that if a 'critical mass' is achieved, a chain reaction will follow. This is because trillions of atoms are present, and at any given moment enough of them will decay to provide the neutrons needed to start the reaction. In a large enough sample, catalysts will be present in a statistical sense. **Wars involve relatively few actors.** Unlike the weak force responsible for nuclear decay, their catalysts are probably **not inherent properties** of the units. Catalysts may or may not be present, and their **potentially random distribution** relative to underlying causes makes it **difficult to predict when or if an appropriate catalyst will occur**. If in the course of time underlying conditions change, reducing basic incentives for one or more parties to use force, catalysts that would have triggered war will no longer do so. This uncertain and evolving relationship between underlying and immediate causes **makes point prediction extraordinarily difficult**. **It also makes more general statements about the causation of war problematic**, since we have **no way of knowing** what wars would have occurred in the presence of appropriate catalysts. It is probably impossible to define the universe of would-be wars or to construct a representative sample of them. Statistical inference requires knowledge about the state of independence of cases, but in a practical sense that knowledge is often **impossible to obtain in the analysis of international relations**.

### Warming

#### Latin America will never adopt renewables – fossil fuels are too economically viable and oil lobby.

Meisen and Krumpel, 9– President of the Global Energy Network Institute / Research-Associate at GENI (Peter and Sebastian, “Renewable Energy Potential of Latin America”, December 2009; < http://www.geni.org/globalenergy/research/renewable-energy-potential-of-latin-america/Potential%20of%20Renewables%20in%20Latin%20America-edited-12-16%20\_Letter\_.pdf>)//Beddow

In reality the situation of renewable energies in Latin America is not as positive or optimistic as we might want to think, or as certain statistical data lead us to believe. There are many problems associated with the implementation of renewables as well as their impact on the environment and society. In this context, the main problem for renewable energies in Latin America is in the way energy and development policies have been constructed. In most cases, energy policies and strategies in Latin America have excluded renewables and other alternatives as being too costly and technologically unfeasible, or by arguing that the country does not have the capabilities to implement them. The easiest explanation for this, and one which is usually mentioned, is the lack of incentive and foresight. Since the region has an abundance of resources such as oil, gas, and hydro, it is in general easier, cheaper and more technically feasible to keep exploiting conventional energy resources than to in vest in renewable energies or create appropriate renewable energy policies. Another common explanation is that the development of renewable energies clash wi th the interest of powerful players, particularly large energy companies, and, therefore, there are few incentives to promote them.

#### Renewables can’t solve warming—they’re not a replacement

Angus 12– ecosocialist advocate, citing an extensive study by Richard York, professor at the University of Oregon with an MS in Environmental Studies from Bemidji State University (Iran, “Green energy won’t save the earth without social change”, 3/21/12; < http://climateandcapitalism.com/2012/03/21/green-energy-alone-wont-save-the-earth/>)//Beddow

The most popular techno-fix for global warming is green energy. If energy companies would only deploy wind, hydro, solar, geothermal or nuclear, then emission-intensive fossil fuels will eventually disappear. But will that actually work? A new study by Richard York of the University of Oregon shows that it isn’t that simple. Rather than displacing fossil fuels, green energy sources have proven to be mostly additive. “Do alternative energy sources displace fossil fuels?” published this month in Nature Climate Change, discusses what happened when alternative energy sources were introduced in countries around the world, over the past fifty years. Contrary to the accepted wisdom that new green energy replaces fossil-fuel use, York found that on average each unit of energy use from non-fossil-fuel sources displaced less than a quarter of a unit of energy use from fossil-fuel sources. The picture is worse with electricity, where each new unit generated from green sources displaced less than one-tenth of a unit of fossil-fuel-generated electricity. York writes: “Based on all of the results presented above, the answer to the question presented in the title of this paper – do alternative energy sources displace fossil fuels? – is yes, but only very modestly. The common assumption that the expansion of production of alternative energy will suppress fossil-fuel energy production in equal proportion is clearly wrong.” Why don’t the new sources replace the old? York identifies two key reasons: the inertia of a huge existing fossil-fuel infrastructure, and the power and influence of the coal and oil corporations. “The failure of non-fossil energy sources to displace fossil ones is probably in part attributable to the established energy system where there is a lock-in to using fossil fuels as the base energy source because of their long-standing prevalence and existing infrastructure and to the political and economic power of the fossil-fuel industry.” In other words, eliminating fossil-fuel as an energy source is at least as much a social and political problem as a technical one. “Of course all societies need energy. So, obviously, if societies are to stop using fossil fuels they must have other energy sources. However, the results from the analyses presented here indicate that the shift away from fossil fuel does not happen inevitably with the expansion of non-fossil-fuel sources, or at least in the political and economic contexts that have been dominant over the past fifty years around the world…. “The most effective strategy for curbing carbon emissions is likely to be one that aims to not only develop non-fossil energy sources, but also to find ways to alter political and economic contexts so that fossil-fuel energy is more easily displaced and to curtail the growth in energy consumption as much as possible. “A general implication of these findings is that polices aimed at addressing global climate change should not focus principally on developing technological fixes, but should also take into account human behaviour in the context of political, economic and social systems.” The evidence shows that simply introducing green energy isn’t enough: the introduction must be accompanied by “explicit policies aimed at reducing carbon emissions.” The article is published in a scientific journal, where political and social conclusions can only be expressed in muted form. But Richard York’s research and conclusions reinforce the argument that he and his co-authors (John Bellamy Foster and Brett Clark) made more explicitly in their recent book, The Ecological Rift: Capitalism’s War on the Planet. “We are confronting the question of a terminal crisis, threatening most life on the planet, civilization, and the very existence of future generations. … attempts to solve this through technological fixes, market magic, and the idea of a ‘sustainable capitalism’ are mere forms of ecological denial, since they ignore the inherent destructiveness of the current system of unsustainable development – capitalism.”

Their Hanson evidence that s

#### Warming inevitable even if we cut emissions to zero—multiple studies confirm

Gillett et al. 10—director @ the Canadian Centre for Climate Modelling and Analysis

Nathan, “Ongoing climate change following a complete cessation of carbon dioxide emissions”. *Nature Geoscience*

Several recent studies have demonstrated that CO2-induced 17 global mean temperature change is irreversible on human 18 timescales1\_5. We find that not only is this climate change 19 irreversible, but that for some climate variables, such as Antarctic 20 temperature and North African rainfall, CO2-induced climate 21 changes are simulated to continue to worsen for many centuries 22 **even after a complete cessation of emissions.** Although it is 23 also well known that a large committed thermosteric sea level 24 rise is expected even after a cessation of emissions in 2100, 25 our finding of a strong delayed high-latitude Southern Ocean 26 warming at intermediate depths suggests that this effect may be 27 compounded by ice shelf collapse, grounding line retreat, and ensuing accelerated ice discharge in marine-based sectors of the 28 Antarctic ice sheet, precipitating a sea level rise of several metres. 29 Quantitative results presented here are subject to uncertainties 30 associated with the climate sensitivity, the rate of ocean heat 31 uptake and the rate of carbon uptake in CanESM1, but our 32 findings of Northern Hemisphere cooling, Southern Hemisphere 33 warming, a southward shift of the intertropical convergence zone, 34 and delayed and ongoing ocean warming at intermediate depths 35 following a cessation of emissions are likely to be robust. Geo- 36 engineering by stratospheric aerosol injection has been proposed 37 as a response measure in the event of a rapid melting of the 38 West Antarctic ice sheet24. Our results indicate that if such a 39 melting were driven by ocean warming at intermediate depths, as 40 is thought likely, a geoengineering response would be ineffective 41 for several centuries owing to the long delay associated with 42 subsurface ocean warming.

#### China makes the impact inevitable and they don’t model

Downs, 8

Eric, Fellow @ Brookings, China Energy Fellow, Foreign Policy, John L. Thornton China Center U.S.-China Economic & Security Review Commission, China’s Energy Policies and Their Environmental Impacts, http://www.brookings.edu/testimony/2008/0813\_china\_downs.aspx

China suffers from a disconnect between the increasingly prominent position of energy issues on its domestic and foreign policy agendas and the capacity of the country’s institutions to manage the energy sector. Some Chinese commentators have even argued that the biggest threat to China’s energy security is posed by the very institutions responsible for enhancing it. Consequently, restructuring China’s energy policymaking apparatus has been a subject of intense debate in recent years as the country has grappled with an unexpected surge in energy demand, growing dependence on energy imports, rising global energy prices and periodic domestic energy supply shortages. Authority over China’s energy sector at the national level is fractured among more than a dozen government agencies, the most important of which is the National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC). Within the NDRC itself, responsibility for energy is similarly scattered among multiple departments. Prior to the restructuring in March 2008, the key component was the Energy Bureau, which had a broad mandate but lacked the authority, tools and manpower to fulfill it. In 2005, the government added another cook to the kitchen with the establishment of the National Energy Leading Group, an advisory body headed by Premier Wen Jiabao. While the leading group’s creation reflected recognition of the need to strengthen energy sector management, it did not eradicate China’s energy governance woes. China’s fragmented energy policymaking structure has impeded energy governance because there is no single institution, such as a Ministry of Energy, with the authority to coordinate the interests of the various stakeholders. For example, the implementation of energy laws is hampered by the fact that those laws often do not specify the government agencies responsible for implementation because of disputes over who should be in charge. Similarly, the fuel tax that the NPC approved in 1999 has not been implemented because of the failure of the relevant stakeholders to reach an agreement. The policy paralysis within the energy bureaucracy stands in sharp contrast to the activism of China’s state-owned energy companies. These firms are powerful and relatively autonomous actors. Their influence is derived from their full and vice ministerial ranks, the membership of some top executives in the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, industry expertise, internationally listed subsidiaries and profitability (at least until recently). More often than not, it is China’s energy firms who initiate major energy projects and policies that are later embraced by the government, such as the West-East Pipeline and the acquisition of foreign energy assets. The companies also have some capacity to advance corporate interests at the expense of national ones. For example, oil and power generating companies have periodically reduced their output to pressure the government to raise the state-set prices of refined products and electricity, which have not kept pace with increases in the market-determined prices of crude oil and coal. Similarly, China’s national oil companies have ignored guidance from the central government about where they should invest overseas. II. China’s “new” energy policymaking structure The recent changes to China’s energy policymaking apparatus are the latest in a series of institutional reforms aimed at improving energy governance. In March 2008, the NPC approved two additions to China’s energy bureaucracy – the State Energy Commission (SEC) and the National Energy Administration (NEA). The SEC, a high-level discussion and coordination body whose specific functions, organization and staffing have not yet been determined, will replace the National Energy Leading Group. The daily affairs of the SEC will be handled by the NEA, a vice-ministerial component of the NDRC, which is the successor to the NDRC’s Energy Bureau. In addition to the Energy Bureau, the NEA is also comprised of other energy offices from the NDRC, the Office of the National Leading Group, and the nuclear power administration of the Commission of Science, Technology and Industry for National Defense. The NEA has a broad mandate, which includes managing the country’s energy industries, drafting energy plans and policies, negotiating with international energy agencies and approving foreign energy investments. The NEA, like its predecessor, will struggle to fulfill its mandate because it lacks the authority, autonomy, manpower and tools to deal with the country’s energy challenges. Although the NEA’s capabilities in each of these areas are greater than those possessed by the NDRC Energy Bureau, they still fall short of what the NEA needs to do its job. Authority: The NEA has more political clout than its predecessor, but not enough to mitigate the bureaucratic infighting that undermines energy decision-making. The NEA is a vice-ministerial body, which is a step above that of the Energy Bureau, which was a bureau-level organization. However, the NEA still does not have the authority it needs to coordinate the interests of ministries, commissions and state-owned energy companies. One of the frustrations of officials in the NDRC Energy Bureau was that the energy companies often undercut their authority by circumventing the Bureau to hold face-to-face discussions with China’s senior leadership. The authority of the NEA is somewhat enhanced by the appointment of Zhang Guobao, a Vice-Chairman of the NDRC with full ministerial rank, as head of the NEA. While it was widely expected that Zhang would retire, his new position is a reflection of his substantial energy expertise. Zhang, who has worked at the NDRC since 1983, is a smart and skillful bureaucrat with encyclopedic knowledge of China’s energy sector. He has overseen the development of some of the country’s major infrastructure projects, including the West-East Pipeline, the transmission of electricity from west to east, the Qinghai-Tibet Railway and the expansion of Beijing Capital International Airport. Autonomy: The NEA is a creature of the NDRC. Some Chinese media reports speculated that the fact that the NEA’s offices will be separate from those of the NDRC and that the NEA will have its own Party Group – which will give the NEA greater autonomy in managing its affairs, including personnel decisions – are signs of the NEA’s independence. However, the fact that Zhang Guobao – an NDRC “lifer” – is head of the NEA and its Party Group indicates that the NEA’s room to maneuver will be constrained by the NDRC. Moreover, the NEA’s independence is limited by the fact that key tools it needs to effectively manage the energy sector are in the hands of the NDRC. Tools: Arguably the greatest constraint on the NEA’s ability to fulfill its mandate is the fact that is does not possess the authority to set energy prices, which remain the purview of the NDRC’s Pricing Department. The issue of who would end up with the power to determine energy prices was, in the words of Zhang Guobao, a subject of “constant dispute” during the bureaucratic reorganization. Although the NEA can make suggestions about energy price adjustments and should be consulted by the NDRC on any proposed changes, the shots are still being called by the NDRC (and ultimately the State Council, whose approval is needed for any major energy price changes). The fact that the NDRC retained control over energy prices is hardly surprising. The power to set prices is one of the NDRC’s main instruments of macroeconomic control, which it understandably is reluctant to relinquish, especially to a subordinate component which might be tempted to adjust energy prices in ways that run counter to broader NDRC objectives, such as combating inflation. The NEA’s lack of authority over energy prices makes its task of mitigating the current electricity shortages, which are partly rooted in price controls, especially challenging. Electricity prices are set by the state, while coal prices are determined by the market. The failure of electricity price increases to keep pace with soaring coal prices has contributed to the national power shortage because some electricity producers can't afford coal while others are unwilling to operate at a loss. With no pricing power, the NEA has little choice but to resort to administrative measures to achieve an objective that would be more effectively realized by raising and ultimately liberalizing electricity prices. Personnel: The central government is still managing the energy sector with a skeleton crew. Contrary to rumors that the NEA’s staff would be as large as 200, it ended up with just 112 people. This staff quota is certainly larger than that of the NDRC Energy Bureau, which had only 50 people, but it does not represent a major increase in the number of people directly involved in managing the energy sector at the national level. Moreover, some Chinese media reports have speculated that the NEA may face the problem of “too many generals and not enough soldiers” because at least half of the 112 slots at the NEA are for positions at the deputy department head level and above. The Party organ that determines the functions, internal structure and staff quotas for government institutions probably resisted calls for more personnel out of concern that if it approved a large staff for the NEA, then other government bodies would also press for more manpower at a time when the State Council is trying to streamline the bureaucracy. In sum, China’s new energy administration is unlikely to substantially improve energy governance. The organizational changes are tantamount to rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic. Although the energy bureaucracy looks a bit different, its limited capacities remain largely unchanged. Consequently, we can expect to see a continuation of business as usual: conflicts of interest will impede decision-making; the energy companies will remain important drivers of projects and policies; state-set energy prices will continue to contribute to periodic domestic energy supply shortfalls; and the NEA, with no authority to adjust energy prices, probably will resort to “second best” administrative measures to try to eradicate those shortages. The modest tinkering to China’s energy policymaking apparatus unveiled during the March 2008 NPC meeting reflects the conflicts of interest that stymie energy decision-making. Despite widespread recognition among Chinese officials and energy experts of the need to get the country’s energy institutions “right” and the growing chorus of voices calling for the establishment of a Ministry of Energy (MOE), there are powerful ministerial and corporate interests that favor the status quo. The opposition to the creation of a MOE, a hot topic of debate in Chinese energy circles in recent years, was led by the NDRC and the state-owned energy companies. The mere specter of a MOE strikes fear in the heart of the NDRC because it would deprive the NDRC of a substantial portion of its portfolio and important tools of macroeconomic control. The NDRC’s aversion is shared by the energy firms who are reluctant to have another political master and afraid that a MOE would limit their direct access to China’s leadership. Such opposition helps explain why the government was unable to forge a consensus in favor of more robust changes to China’s energy policymaking apparatus. Implications for the United States First, US policymakers should recognize that China’s fractured energy policymaking apparatus may constrain the Chinese government from doing all that US policymakers would like it to do – and indeed what Chinese leaders themselves might want to do – to enhance international energy security and combat climate change. If China falls short of our expectations it may not reflect a conscious decision by Beijing to shirk its global responsibilities but rather the limited capacity of its national energy institutions to bend other actors, notably firms and local governments, to its will.

#### China key to solving emissions

Chen et al., 10Chen, Qian, Peridas, Qiu, Ho: Natural Resources Defense Council, Friedmann: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Li, Wei: Institute of Rock and Soil Mechanics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Sung, Fowler: Clean Air Task Force, Seligsohn, Liu, Forbes: World Resources Institute, Zhang: China Tsinghua University, Zhao: Institute of Engineering Thermophysics, Chinese Academy of Sciences (Jason Chen, Jingjing Qian, George Peridas, Yueming Qiu, Bruce Ho, Julio Friedmann, Xiaochun Li, Ning Wei, S. Ming Sung, Mike Fowler, Deborah Seligsohn, Yue Liu, Sarah Forbes, Dongjie Zhang, Lifeng Zhao, December 2010, “Identifying Near-Term Opportunities For Carbon Capture and Sequestration (CCS) in China,” [http://docs.nrdc.org/international/files/int\_10121001a.pdf)](http://docs.nrdc.org/international/files/int_10121001a.pdf)//DR)

Coal—the most carbon-laden of the three major fossil fuels (i.e., natural gas, crude oil, and coal)—supplies nearly **70 percent** of China’s energy. China’s heavy reliance on this fuel is reflected by the fact that during the last five years the country has accounted for nearly fourfifths of the global growth in coal consumption.8 In 2008, China consumed more coal than North and South America, the European Union, Russia, the Middle East, and Africa combined (see Figure 2.1). Heavy reliance on coal has sharply driven up China’s CO2 emissions. In 1994, China emitted 3.07 billion tons, or gigatons (Gt), of CO2. A decade later, in 2004, China’s CO2 emissions stood 60 percent higher, at over 5 Gt a year.9 As a result, China’s annual CO2 emissions now exceed those of the United States.10 With its CO2 emissions surging nearly eight times faster than in the rest of the world (see Figure 2.2), China has a pivotal role to play in the global effort to prevent the worst impacts of global warming from occurring.11

### Solvency

#### Your solvency advocate says there’s a ton of stuff you need to do which you don’t do

Rodriguez 9 — Raul Rodriguez, serves as the Chairman of the Board of Advisors of the North American Center for Transborder Studies at Arizona State University, Benson Chair in Banking and Finance and Distinguished Professor at the HEB School of Business and Administration at the University of the Incarnate Word in San Antonio, Texas and the President of RMI, an investment and trade consulting firm in Mexico, former CEO and Managing Director of the North American Development Bank (NADBank) until October 2005. Prior to joining the NADBank, he was Executive Director of the Mexican Foreign Trade Bank; the Bank’s Director for Asia; Mexico’s Trade Commissioner in Canada during the NAFTA negotiation; and Secretary of Economic Development for the Mexican border State of Tamaulipas (Raul Rodriguez, The Wilson Center Mexico Institute and El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, June 2009, "The Future of the North American Development Bank", http://wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/RODRIGUEZ NADBANK.pdf, Accessed 08-21-2013)

Lexington’s card begins

Many agencies and programs have a bearing on border issues, but the region still ¶ lacks an effective and cohesive institutional base, particularly on a bilateral scale. ¶ Prevailing political thinking in Washington—and to a certain extent in Mexico City—¶ and the current economic situation are not conducive to creating supranational ¶ structures; so while Europe bursts with a cumbersome and bloated institutional life, ¶ North America remains anemic by comparison.¶ Its mere existence and capacity for reform given its small size and overhead make ¶ NADB a valuable asset. Only an accountable and trusted institutional body with a ¶ mandate on both sides of the border and subject to bilateral oversight will allow for ¶ further resource transfers and productive interaction. With its track record of tackling ¶ difficult sectors and its untapped potential, NADB could truly become the long ¶ overdue border bank. It is time for NADB and its mandate to reach beyond the ¶ environment to other areas where it can be a vital funding and capacity-building ¶ instrument. ¶ Mexico has sought a broader mandate for NADB since 2000. President Felipe ¶ Calderón has acknowledged its value and the need to continue expanding its role. He ¶ has underscored the “very positive outcomes” of NADB financing; his “commitment ¶ to promote” further “reforms of the Bank’s mandate” in order to “eliminate ¶ restrictions and improve its operations”; and the need to increase single obligor ¶ limits and to expand the mandate to cover “infrastructure projects in general”, and ¶ not just environmental projects (speech at the VI National Convention, American ¶ Chamber of Commerce; February 27, 2007). ¶ Some progress has been made along Pres. Calderon’s line of thinking. In 2008 the ¶ Bank authorized increasing the single-obligor limit, as well as financing for a new ¶ type of air quality improvement project: border crossing infrastructure. ¶ NADB’s role also fits within President Barack Obama’s agenda in terms of the critical ¶ importance of infrastructure development, the need to tend to border issues, and the ¶ structuring of more positive and comprehensive cooperative efforts with Mexico. ¶ Both federal governments are sponsoring infrastructure programs along the border ¶ as part of their economic stimulus initiatives that will render synergies if closely ¶ coordinated. ¶ A drawn-out debate has taken place among environmentalists along the border who ¶ would like BECC and NADB to continue concentrated on their current mandate and ¶ those who believe they should cater to much broader infrastructure needs and an ¶ extended jurisdiction. There is a valid argument in making sure these institutions ¶ remain focused and clearly there is still much to do environmentally. But there is a ¶ wider range of needs along the border that require urgent attention, face decreasing ¶ government funding, and are not profitable enough to be financed by commercial ¶ banks or the private sector. Addressing these needs would not only have a high ¶ impact on the quality of life of the population but would also foster job creation and ¶ economic development. In addition, covering more profitable sectors would enhance ¶ the Bank’s ability to respond to projects lacking credit capacity. ¶ Below are ten of the actions and policy initiatives that have been debated in recent ¶ years with regard to achieving an expanded and more effective role for NADB: ¶ A. Expand the mandate to include additional infrastructure sectors: ¶ The Bank requires a more flexible mandate that takes into account a broader set ¶ of criteria that do not focus excessively on quantifiable environmental benefits. ¶ Currently the Board sets very high environmental benefit thresholds on projects. ¶ Factors relating to the broader goals of infrastructure improvement and economic ¶ development should be considered in addition to environmental criteria in a ¶ balanced way. ¶ Some sectors are more amenable than others for bilateral cooperation. Water—¶ and environmental infrastructure in general—has been a must in view of its ¶ strategic importance as a shared and scarce resource on both sides of the border ¶ and given its growing complexity. Transportation and logistics, among other ¶ areas, is a natural choice: fostering the corridors concept, linking inland port ¶ projects and facilities on both sides, helping address the tradeoffs with security ¶ measures, promoting customs systems and bridge and road projects that have ¶ faced endless delays. Maximizing the use of current infrastructure and addressing ¶ mismanagement, coordination and harmonization issues should continue to be ¶ part of NADB’s focus. ¶ The Bank should become more fully engaged with the development and ¶ expansion of ports of entry and border crossings. In the context of security ¶ imperatives, investments aimed at facilitating the construction and improvement ¶ of crossings through public-private partnerships might be the most important ¶ contribution to the border’s development today. ¶ The need for legislation to authorize further expansion into other infrastructure ¶ sectors has been debated. Some suggest it is simply an issue for the ¶ governments to resolve. However, given the restrictive interpretations of the ¶ charter, if a favorable legislative climate develops its amendment would be ¶ advisable if broad mandate expansion were to be considered. ¶ A lingering question is how much of a BECC certification process should be ¶ applied to projects in new sectors. Public and stakeholder participation in project ¶ development, approval and support has been a fundamental contribution of BECC ¶ over the years, but there is a concern—particularly among private sector ¶ investors—that it delays the funding process unduly. Expedited NADB lending ¶ approval processes will also be critical in order to foster more private sector ¶ participation. ¶ As new sectors are addressed, it will be crucial to find even more creative ways to ¶ mitigate risks, foster long-term financing in the local currency, and leverage funds ¶ from different sources. A key role for the NADB will be to help enhance project ¶ conditions and provide guarantees in order to link with private financial markets¶ where affordable long-term funds in a multi-year programming context might be ¶ available. ¶ B. Allow for more flexibility in the Bank’s geographic jurisdiction: ¶ Most analysts agree that the Bank should continue to be essentially a border ¶ institution. Beyond the fact that it best fills a void and a niche by remaining ¶ focused on the region, it would be politically unrealistic from a U.S. perspective to ¶ expect a bolder expansion of its reach anytime soon. However, working along ¶ trade corridors that directly affect the border would make sense, implementing the ¶ “perimeter” concept in a reasonable way. ¶ C. Increase the channeling of federal and state funds through NADB, starting with a ¶ refurbished Border Environment Infrastructure Fund (BEIF): ¶ There are socially critical areas of infrastructure that provide sound foundations ¶ for economic competitiveness but will not be profitable anytime soon and will ¶ continue to require strong government intervention. Governments should apply ¶ more strict “additionality” criteria to their limited investment: concentrate on what ¶ others cannot and focus on making a difference. ¶ Subsidy allocation needs to be greatly improved to make sure it reaches the ¶ poorest segments of the population and achieves better capital-to-output ¶ quotients. There are benchmarks available that suggest the maximum amount that ¶ poor households should spend out of their median income on public services, ¶ which can serve as a guideline for affordability analyses and tailored subsidies. ¶ Revolving funds should be the vehicle for making better use of scarce grant ¶ funds, and U.S. experience in that regard is relevant. ¶ The Bank has been successful in administering EPA funds, particularly serving as ¶ an efficient mechanism for applying them in Mexico to issues of priority to the ¶ U.S. government. Based on that experience, the Bank could be a conduit for other ¶ government funds, i.e. potential General Services Administration (GSA) resources ¶ for port of entry infrastructure on the Mexican side or other EPA funds, such as ¶ energy-related grants. ¶ The BEIF (see Appendix) is a significant cooperation precedent that should be ¶ preserved and expanded. It has funded over US$533 million in water and ¶ wastewater infrastructure relevant to both sides of the border, making projects ¶ affordable for communities by allowing NADB to combine grant funds with loans. ¶ Every EPA grant dollar has leveraged approximately two dollars from other ¶ sources. In Mexico it is applied pari passu with Mexican funds and has led the ¶ Mexican National Water Commission (CONAGUA) to triple its investment in the ¶ border in the past three years. Every project, whether located in the U.S. or ¶ Mexico, has provided an environmental and human health benefit for the U.S. ¶ Adequate oversight and transparency in the procurement and funding processes ¶ have been key to building bilateral trust in this program throughout the years. ¶ Because of increasing funding limitations, BECC, in coordination with EPA and ¶ NADB, has implemented a prioritization process to identify projects which will ¶ address the most severe environmental and human health conditions existing in ¶ the border region. In the federal budget, funding allocated to the U.S.-Mexico ¶ Border Program that feeds the BEIF and BECC’s Project Development Assistance ¶ Program (PDAP) dropped from almost US$50 million to US$20 million in FY2008 ¶ and only US$10 million has been proposed for FY2009 (see BECC-NADB chart ¶ below). That amount is not even sufficient to address five percent of total ¶ documented needs. Annual BEIF allocations of at least US$100 million should be ¶ justified for future funding cycles.

Lexington’s card ends

**D. Review single-obligor lending limits: ¶** In order to further ramp up its lending, the Bank periodically reviews its capital ¶ adequacy model and existing policies on lending limits. In 2006 it increased its ¶ credit exposure per project to cover up to 85 percent of the overall project cost ¶ (100 percent for projects costing US$1 million or less). ¶ NADB has also established a single obligor limit equal to 15 percent of its ¶ available capital resources and 25 percent under certain conditions. Based on 15 ¶ percent, the current limit per borrower is estimated at US$65.3 million. This could ¶ be made more flexible based on federal guarantees that some projects could ¶ provide as backstop. ¶ **E. Advance the Bank’s role on the U.S. side through stronger credit-enhancement ¶ capabilities**: ¶ The availability of a municipal bond market considerably limits the appeal of ¶ NADB financing in the U.S. The greater potential lies in assisting communities in ¶ accessing market funding as a guarantor and credit enhancer. ¶ The intent of proposed legislation (H.R. 1060 introduced in February 2009) **is to ¶ amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986** to clarify that a NADB guarantee is not ¶ considered a federal guarantee for purposes of determining the tax-exempt status ¶ of bonds. It provides clarification that NADB is able to guarantee bonds issued by ¶ state or local governments in the U.S. without jeopardizing the federal tax-exempt ¶ status of payments of principle and interest on such bonds. ¶ There are some border stakeholders that believe NADB’s ability to enter into ¶ credit enhancement arrangements with U.S. border communities that issue tax ¶ exempt debt would provide a significant benefit to those communities by lowering ¶ the cost of their debt. The proposed legislation would lay to rest the fundamental ¶ concern that has inhibited NADB participation in tax exempt issuances. ¶ **F. Use NADB as the vehicle to test and expand municipal bond financing in Mexico**: ¶ Over the past twenty years, municipal reform in Mexico has concentrated mostly ¶ on the transfer of federal funds and key responsibilities, leaving local financial ¶ instruments, management structures and practices unchanged in many instances. ¶ The lack of transparency, professionalization and continuity at all levels of ¶ municipal government is still prevalent. Inadequate legal and contractual ¶ frameworks, board configurations, pricing practices and tariff structures, billing ¶ and collection systems, and staffing continue to encumber the performance of ¶ local public utilities and their access to credit. ¶ By contrast, the U.S. tax-exempt municipal and revenue bond markets are ¶ pervasive and have had continued success and very low rates of default. The key ¶ is the fiscal setting and the significant firewall that exists between electoral ¶ politics and city or utility management. That separation is still a crucial challenge ¶ in Mexico for any market mechanism to work in the less developed sectors. ¶ NADB can assist in the development of better conditions for municipal financing ¶ by strengthening its requirements and providing direct incentives for improved ¶ financial governance, especially on the Mexican side. It can also assist in testing ¶ new financing settings and tools, conducive to expanding municipal bond ¶ markets.¶ **G. Use NADB as an instrument to foster, test and implement municipal reforms in ¶ Mexico**: ¶ Infrastructure finance in the developing world is beset not only by funding ¶ shortages, but by challenges in credit capacity, design, groundwork tasks, ¶ procurement, administration and control. **Oftentimes, a project’s constraint is not ¶ financial**. Adequate conditions to fund and disburse are frequently lacking, and ¶ waste, corruption and the inability to properly manage projects are extensive. ¶ These constraints call for institutional strengthening and technical assistance. ¶ At BECC and NADB, such efforts are of substantial importance to financing along ¶ the border. All NADB financing should be used to encourage institutional reforms ¶ and efficiencies. Good management leads to better financing alternatives, ¶ encouraging a virtuous cycle. ¶ NADB has strived to transfer successful experiences in the U.S. to the Mexican ¶ side regarding city and utility management and municipal finance. It is engaged in ¶ over 150 border communities, assisting with utility and project development and ¶ providing training. Its Utility Management Institute (UMI) is enhancing the ¶ managerial, financial and leadership capabilities necessary to operate a ¶ successful utility (see Appendix).

## 2NC

### 2NC FW

Giordano and Li is about computer simulation, not debate…

effects of trade reforms is an extremely sensitive task highly¶ dependent on the quality of the data and the correct specification of the simulation instruments.

Ontology is politics

Dillon 99 (Michael Dillon, professor of politics at the University of Lancaster, 1999, “Moral Spaces: Rethinking Ethics and World Politics,” pp 97-8)

Heirs to all this, we find ourselves in the turbulent and now globalized wake of its confluence. As Heidegger-himself an especially revealing figure of the deep and mutual implication of the philosophical and the political4-never tired of pointing out, the relevance of ontology to all other kinds of thinking is fundamental and inescapable. For one cannot say anything about anything that is, without always already having made assumptions about the is as such. Any mode of thought, in short, always already carries an ontology sequestered within it. What this ontological turn does to other regional modes of thought is to challenge the ontology within which they operate. The implications of that review reverberate throughout the entire mode of thought, demanding a reappraisal as fundamental as the reappraisal ontology has demanded of philosophy. With ontology at issue, the entire foundations or underpinnings of any mode of thought are rendered problematic. This applies as much to any modern discipline of thought as it does to the question of modernity as such, with the exception, it seems, of science, which, having long ago given up the ontological questioning of when it called itself natural philosophy, appears now, in its industrialized and corporatized form, to be invulnerable to ontological perturbation. With its foundations at issue, the very authority of a mode of thought and the ways in which it characterizes the critical issues of freedom and judgment (of what kind of universe human beings inhabit, how they inhabit it, and what counts as reliable knowledge for them in it) is also put in question. The very ways in which Nietzsche, Heidegger, and other continental philosophers challenged Western ontology, simultaneously, therefore reposed the fundamental and inescapable difficulty, or aporia, for human being of decision and judgment. In other words, whatever ontology you subscribe to, knowingly or unknowingly, as a human being you still have to act. Whether or not you know or acknowledge it, the ontology you subscribe to will construe the problem of action for you in one way rather than another. You may think ontology is some arcane question of philosophy, but Nietzsche and Heidegger showed that it intimately shapes not only a way of thinking, but a way of being, a form of life. Decision, a fortiori political decision, in short, is no mere technique. It is instead a way of being that bears an understanding of Being, and of the fundaments of the human way of being within it. This applies, indeed applies most, to those mock innocent political slaves who claim only to be technocrats of decision making.

IR is tied to epistemology

Calkivik 10 (Emine Asli Calkivik, PhD in political science from the University of Minnesota, October 2010, “Dismantling Security,” http://purl.umn.edu/99479) gz

In contrast to traditional approaches to security, which assume an objective¶ world that operates according to ahistorical formal models and rely on a statist¶ political ontology that naturalizes the meaning of what security is and how it can be¶ achieved,120 critical approaches attend to the relations of power that structure the¶ production of in/securities and expose the processes by which national identities and¶ what are deemed as a danger to those identities are constructed. A common point¶ shared by these engagements is their emphasis on the ethical dimension of scholarly¶ inquiry as well as the recognition that knowledge claims are always embedded in¶ relations of power. Their emphasis on the “ought” rather than the “is” reflects less a¶ reworking of the hierarchy between material and ideational power than an emphasis¶ on the social nature of global politics and an understanding that all phenomenon¶ pertaining to international relations exists through the cultural and ideological¶ structures through which they are given meaning and legitimated.121¶ Definition and construction of threats and the way in which states respond to¶ those threats constitutes one of the primary items on the agenda of critical scholars.122¶ While conventional analyses of security conceive threats as arising from material¶ capabilities of sovereign states located in a self-help system, critical approaches point¶ to the ways in which threats and intentions are not objectively given but socially¶ constructed: they involve history, culture, and power relations that cannot be reduced¶ to an objective measure of military capabilities. They investigate the ways in which¶ systems of signification and normative structures constrain or regulate collective¶ security practices or transform conduct in war. All of these studies reveal the¶ historically situated dynamics underlying practices that shape the desire to secure¶ bodies, nations, and states.¶ Primary examples of these engagements come from scholars working under¶ the broad banner of Constructivism.123 These scholars take as their premise the¶ proposition that interests and actions of states are socially constructed and therefore¶ subject to change. While leaving intact the traditional assumptions about military and¶ state-centric understandings of security, some of these studies nevertheless challenge¶ the traditional frameworks by explaining security practices through a recourse to¶ ideational elements such as norms and identities rather than relying on material¶ factors.124 In particular, these works challenge Neorealist and Neoliberal approaches,¶ which assume that states are rational, self-help actors in an anarchic environment. For¶ instance, Alexander Wendt in his seminal study shows how different (Hobbesian or¶ Kantian) anarchical cultures can play a role in channeling the security practices of¶ states on different paths.125 Focusing on international norms, such as the prohibitions¶ against the use of chemical and nuclear weapons or norms of humanitarian¶ intervention, other scholars argue that questions about international security cannot be¶ answered by Realist materialist explanations alone.126 An example to these¶ investigations is provided by Risse-Kappen, who argues that NATO’s post-Cold War¶ survival can only be explained with reference to ideational factors such as values and¶ identity—in this case, democratic, liberal values—that guarantee the institution’s¶ survival in the absence of a distinct threat.127¶ The post-Cold War security environment and proliferating threat discourses in¶ the absence of the “Soviet enemy” provide ample resource for scholars who focus on¶ the representational practices that played role in the construction of threats to state¶ security. For instance, Mutimer examines in detail the linguistic and metaphorical¶ construction of threats to the United States and its allies through the “image of¶ proliferation.”128 He points out the way in which a particular discursive framing of a¶ problem—in this case, the construction of the use of chemical or biological weapons¶ as a problem of proliferation as opposed to a problem of disarmament—shapes the¶ constitution of identities and interests of the actors in question and gives way to¶ particular patterns of foreign policy.¶ The discourse of threats and their social production—as well as the¶ construction of the objects of security as an inextricable aspect of security¶ discourses—constitutes an important item on the agenda of critical investigations.129¶ In conventional analyses, the purported state of nature populated by instrumentally¶ rational actors is taken as the departure point of analysis. Within this framework, the¶ state acts as the primary source of authority, the guarantor of order, and the primary¶ protector of the values and interests of these individuals. While the state is rendered¶ the locus of security, security of the state gets equated to the security of the citizen. In¶ contrast to the positing of the state as the locus of security with a neutrally given¶ interest of survival, critical scholars argue that a concept like national security needs to¶ be understood as a social construction rather than an objectively given fact. For¶ instance, in her case study of the Cuban missile crisis, Jutta Weldes shows how a core¶ concept such as the national interest is discursively constituted through¶ representational practices and linguistic elements.130 Other investigations explore the¶ working of security as a political practice, or the processes of construction of threats¶ through institutional mobilization and knowledge production. Some of these scholars¶ use “speech-act theory” to study how utterances of security constitute certain issues as¶ security problems.131¶ A related line of analysis, conducted mostly from post-structural and postcolonial¶ perspectives, is to trace the operation of power in its various guises and to¶ map the hierarchical relations, highlighting the gaps and silences of hegemonic¶ security narratives. In his Writing Security, David Campbell investigates how certain¶ risks are interpreted as dangers, what power effects these interpretative articulations¶ produce, and how they police the boundaries of the political community and produce¶ obedient subjects.132 Going against the grain of state-centric, strategic accounts of war,¶ scholars such as Michael Shapiro bring to focus the role of political violence in the¶ construction of the geopolitical imaginary and the production/ affirmation of collective¶ identity.133 Others focus on the international interventions that took place during the¶ 1990s and discuss the ways in which these imperial investments are legitimated by the¶ West through a moral discourse based on universal values.134¶ Other studies lay bare the historical biases, Eurocentric assumptions, and¶ racialized or gendered content of conceptions, analyses, theories, and practices of¶ security. Attending to the power of representation, they expose the links between¶ economies of power and “truth” in the re/production of international hierarchies and¶ in/securities. Problematizing the representation of post-colonial states as “failed” or¶ lacking, and hence as a major threat to international security, some of these scholars¶ demonstrate how these so-called failures were precisely the products of unequal¶ encounters with Western colonialism, pointing out the ways in which these¶ hierarchical relations were being reproduced through ongoing unequal economic,¶ social, and military relations.135 They analyze the construction of the non-Western¶ subject as the inferior other—“the Southern” or “the Oriental”—and attend to the¶ ways in which these representations are mobilized to legitimate certain security¶ practices and policies such as nuclear proliferation in the Third World.136 Introducing¶ feminist perspectives into their analyses, other scholars expose the gender biases¶ imbued in security practices, problematizing state security for rendering violence and¶ insecurity from the perspective of women.137

Representations and the affective field of images are the basis and motivation for war. What we lack is not a proper scientific or empirical challenge to violence; we lack the cultural critics willing to fight the fear mongering which results in war. The AFF’s discourse is enmeshed in a form of affective securitization that makes war inevitable. As scholars, we have an obligation to refuse and problematize the cultural grammar of security.

Elliott 2012

/Emory, University Professor of the University of California and Distinguished Professor of English at the University of California, Riverside Terror, Theory, and the Humanities ed. Di Leo, Open Humanities Press, Online/

In a 1991 interview for the New York Times Magazine, Don DeLillo expressed his views on the place of literature in our times in a statement that he has echoed many times since and developed most fully in his novel Mao II: In a repressive society, a writer can be deeply influential, but in a society that’s ﬁlled with glut and endless consumption, the act of terror may be the only meaningful act. People who are in power make their arrangements in secret, largely as a way of maintaining and furthering that power. People who are powerless make an open theater of violence. True terror is a language and a vision. There is a deep narrative structure to terrorist acts, and they infiltrate and alter consciousness in ways that writers used to aspire to. (qtd. in DePietro 84) The implications of DeLillo’s statement are that we are all engaged in national, international, transnational, and global conflicts in which acts of representation, including those of terrorism and spectacular physical violence as well as those of language, performance, and art compete for the attention of audiences and for influence in the public sphere. In the early days of the Iraq War, the United States used the power of images, such as those of the “mother of all bombs” and a wide array of weapons, as well as aesthetic techniques to influence and shape the consciousness of millions and to generate strong support for the war. The shock, fear, and nationalism aroused in those days after 9/11 have enabled the Bush administration to pursue a military agenda that it had planned before 9/11. Since then, the extraordinary death and destruction, scandals and illegalities, and domestic and international demonstrations and criticisms have been unable to alter the direction of this agenda. Those of us in the humanities who are trained as critical readers of political and social texts, as well as of complex artistically constructed texts, are needed now more urgently than ever to analyze the relationships between political power and the wide range of rhetorical methods being employed by politicians and others to further their destructive effects in the world. If humanities scholars can create conscious awareness of how such aesthetic devices such as we see in those photos achieve their affective appeal, citizens may begin to understand how they are being manipulated and motivated by emotion rather than by reason and logic. In spite of our ability to expose some of these verbal and visual constructions as devices of propaganda that function to enflame passions and stifle reasonable discussion, we humanities scholars find ourselves marginalized and on the defensive in our institutions of higher learning where our numbers have been diminished and where we are frequently being asked to justify the significance of our research and teaching. While we know the basic truth that the most serious threats to our societies today are more likely to result from cultural differences and failures of communication than from inadequate scientific information or technological inadequacies, we have been given no voice in this debate. With the strong tendency toward polarized thinking and opinion and the evangelical and fundamentalist religious positions in the US today and in other parts of the world, leaders continue to abandon diplomacy and resort to military actions. Most government leaders find the cultural and social explanations of the problems we face to be vague, and they are frustrated by complex human issues. That is not reason enough, however, for us to abandon our efforts to influence and perhaps even alter the current course of events. In spite of the discouragements that we as scholars of the humanities are experiencing in these times, it seems to me that we have no option but to continue to pursue our research and our teaching and hope to influence others to question the meaning and motives of what they see and hear.

### 2NC AT: Perm

**Footnoting DA**

**Der Derian 95** (James, Professor of Political Science – University of Massachusetts, International Theory: Critical Investigations, p. 374)

But what happens - as seems to be the case to this observer - when the 'we' fragments, 'realism' takes on prefixes and goes plural, the meaning of meaning itself is up for grabs? A stop-gap solution is to supplement the definitional gambit with a facile gesture. The IR theorist, mindful of a creeping pluralism, will note the 'essentially contested' nature of realism - duly backed up with a footnote to W. B. Gallie or W E. Connolly - and then get down to business as usual, that is, using realism as the best language to reflect a self-same phenomenon. This amounts to an intellectual plea of nolo-contendere: in exchange for not contesting the charge that the meaning of realism is contestable, the IR 'perp' gets off easy, to then turn around and commit worse epistemological crimes. In honor of the most notorious benefactor of nolo-contendere in recent American legal history, we might call this the 'Spiro-ette effect' in International Relations.

The permutation is a teleological knee jerk which blocks out critique

**Burke 7** (Anthony, lecturer at Adelaide University School of History and Politics, Beyond Security, Ethics and Violence, p. 3-4)

These frameworks are interrogated at the level both of their theoretical conceptualisation and their practice: in their influence and implementation in specific policy contexts and conflicts in East and Central Asia, the Middle East and the 'war on terror', where their meaning and impact take on greater clarity. This approach is based on a conviction that the meaning of powerful political concepts cannot be abstract or easily universalised: they all have histories, often complex and conflictual; their forms and meanings change over time; and they are developed, refined and deployed in concrete struggles over power, wealth and societal form. While this should not preclude normative debate over how political or ethical concepts should be defined and used, and thus be beneficial or destructive to humanity, it embodies a caution that the meaning of concepts can never be stabilised or unproblematic in practice. Their normative potential must always be considered in relation to their utilisation in systems of political, social and economic power and their consequent worldly effects. Hence this book embodies a caution by Michel Foucault, who warned us about the 'politics of truth . . the battle about the status of truth and the economic and political role it plays', and it is inspired by his call to 'detach the power of truth from the forms of hegemony, social, economic and cultural, within which it operates at the present time'.1 It is clear that traditionally coercive and violent approaches to security and strategy are both still culturally dominant, and politically and ethically suspect. However, the reasons for pursuing a critical analysis relate not only to the most destructive or controversial approaches, such as the war in Iraq, but also to their available (and generally preferable) alternatives. There is a necessity to question not merely extremist versions such as the Bush doctrine, Indonesian militarism or Israeli expansionism, but also their mainstream critiques - whether they take the form of liberal policy approaches in international relations (IR), just war theory, US realism, optimistic accounts of globalisation, rhetorics of sensitivity to cultural difference, or centrist Israeli security discourses based on territorial compromise with the Palestinians. The surface appearance of lively (and often significant) debate masks a deeper agreement about major concepts, forms of political identity and the imperative to secure them. Debates about when and how it may be effective and legitimate to use military force in tandem with other policy options, for example, mask a more fundamental discursive consensus about the meaning of security, the effectiveness of strategic power, the nature of progress, the value of freedom or the promises of national and cultural identity. As a result, political and intellectual debate about insecurity, violent conflict and global injustice can become hostage to a claustrophic structure of political and ethical possibility that systematically wards off critique.

### 2NC China

Discourse of Chinese aggression is a neoliberal ploy masking the paranoiac fear of the decline of dollar hegemony – their discourse becomes a justification for further militarism and aggression

Cunningham 12/1 (Finian Cunningham, expert in international affairs specializing in the Middle East, former journalist expelled from Bahrain due to his revealing of human rights violations committed by the Western-backed regime, basically a badass, 12-1-13, “Dollar survival behind US-China tensions,” <http://nsnbc.me/2013/12/01/dollar-survival-behind-us-china-tensions/>) gz

The escalation of military tensions between Washington and Beijing in the East China Sea is superficially over China’s unilateral declaration of an air defense zone. But the real reason for Washington’s ire is the recent Chinese announcement that it is planning to reduce its holdings of the US dollar.¶ That move to offload some of its 3.5 trillion in US dollar reserves combined with China’s increasing global trade in oil based on national currencies presents a mortal threat to the American petrodollar and the entire American economy.¶ This threat to US viability – already teetering on bankruptcy, record debt and social meltdown – would explain why Washington has responded with such belligerence to China setting up an Air Defense Identification Zone (ADIZ) last week extending some 400 miles from its coast into the East China Sea.¶ ¶ Beijing said the zone was aimed at halting intrusive military maneuvers by US spy planes over its territory. The US has been conducting military flights over Chinese territory for decades without giving Beijing the slightest notification.¶ ¶ Back in April 2001, a Chinese fighter pilot was killed when his aircraft collided with a US spy plane. The American crew survived, but the incident sparked a diplomatic furor, with Beijing saying that it illustrated Washington’s unlawful and systematic violation of Chinese sovereignty.¶ Within days of China’s announcement of its new ADIZ last week, the US sent two B52 bombers into the air space without giving the notification of flight paths required by Beijing.¶ ¶ American allies Japan and South Korea also sent military aircraft in defiance of China. Washington dismissed the Chinese declared zone and asserted that the area was international air space.¶ A second intrusion of China’s claimed air territory involved US surveillance planes and up to 10 Japanese American-made F-15 fighter jets. On that occasion, Beijing has responded more forcefully by scrambling SU-30 and J-10 warplanes, which tailed the offending foreign aircraft.¶ Many analysts see the latest tensions as part of the ongoing dispute between China and Japan over the islands known, respectively, as the Diaoyu and Senkaku, located in the East China Sea. Both countries claim ownership. The islands are uninhabited but the surrounding sea is a rich fishing ground and the seabed is believed to contain huge reserves of oil and gas.¶ By claiming the skies over the islands, China appears to be adding to its territorial rights to the contested islands.¶ In a provocative warning to Beijing, American defense secretary Chuck Hagel this week reiterated that the decades-old US-Japan military pact covers any infringement by China of Japan’s claim on the Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands.¶ It is hard to justify Washington and Tokyo’s stance on the issue. The islands are much nearer to China’s mainland (250 miles) compared with Japan’s (600 miles). China claims that the islands were part of its territory for centuries until Japan annexed them in 1895 during its imperialist expansion, which eventually led to an all-out invasion and war of aggression on China.¶ Also, as Beijing points out, the US and its postwar Japanese ally both have declared their own air defense zones. It is indeed inconceivable that Chinese spy planes and bombers could encroach unannounced on the US West Coast without the Pentagon ordering fierce retaliation.¶ Furthermore, maps show that the American-backed air defense zone extending from Japan’s southern territory is way beyond any reasonable halfway limit between China and Japan. This American-backed arbitrary imposition on Chinese territorial sovereignty is thus seen as an arrogant convention, set up and maintained by Washington for decades.¶ The US and its controlled news media are absurdly presenting Beijing’s newly declared air defense zone as China “flexing its muscles and stoking tensions.” And Washington is claiming that it is nobly defending its Japanese and South Korea allies from Chinese expansionism.¶ However, it is the background move by China to ditch the US dollar that is most likely the real cause for Washington’s militarism towards Beijing. The apparent row over the air and sea territory, which China has sound rights to, is but the pretext for the US to mobilize its military and in effect threaten China with aggression.¶ In recent years, China has been incrementally moving away from US financial hegemony. This hegemony is predicated on the US dollar being the world reserve currency and, by convention, the standard means of payment for international trade and in particular trade in oil. That arrangement is obsolete given the bankrupt state of the US economy. But it allows the US to continue bingeing on credit.¶ China – the second biggest economy in the world and a top importer of oil – has or is seeking oil trading arrangements with its major suppliers, including Russia, Saudi Arabia, Iran and Venezuela, which will involve the exchange of national currencies. That development presents a grave threat to the petrodollar and its global reserve status.¶ The latest move by Beijing on November 20 giving notice that it intends to shift its risky foreign exchange holdings of US Treasury notes for a mixture of other currencies is a harbinger that the¶ American economy’s days are numbered, as Paul Craig Roberts noted last week.¶ ¶ This is of course China’s lawful right to do so, as are its territorial claims. But, in the imperialist, megalomaniac mindset of Washington, the “threat” to the US economy and indebted way of life is perceived as a tacit act of war. That is why Washington is reacting so furiously and desperately to China’s newly declared air corridor. It is a pretext for the US to clench an iron fist.

### 2NC Warming

Environmental apocalypticism causes eco-authoritarianism and mass violence against those deemed environmental threats – also causes political apathy which turns case

Buell 3 (Frederick Buell, cultural critic on the environmental crisis and a Professor of English at Queens College and the author of five books; “From Apocalypse To Way of Life,” pg. 185-186)

Looked at critically, then, **crisis discourse** thus suffers from a number of liabilities. First, it seems to have become a **political liability** almost as much as an asset. It calls up a **fierce and effective opposition** with its predictions; worse, its more specific predictions are all too **vulnerable to refutation by events**. It also **exposes environmentalists to being called grim doomsters** and antilife Puritan extremists. Further, concern with crisis has all too often tempted people to try to find a “**total solution**” to the problems involved— a phrase that, as an astute analyst of the limitations of crisis discourse, John Barry, puts it, is all too reminiscent of the Third Reich’s infamous “**final solution**.”55 A total crisis of society—environmental crisis at its gravest—threatens to translate despair into **inhumanist authoritarianism**; more often, however, it helps keep merely dysfunctional authority in place. It thus leads, Barry suggests, to the belief that only elite- and expert-led solutions are possible.56 At the same timeit **depoliticizes people**, inducing them to accept their impotence as individuals; this is something that has made many people today feel, ironically and/or passively, that since it makes no difference at all what any individual does on his or her own, one might as well go along with it. Yet another pitfall for the full and sustained elaboration of environmental crisis is, though least discussed, perhaps the most deeply ironic. A problem with deep cultural and psychological as well as social effects, it is embodied in a startlingly simple proposition: the worse one feels environmental crisis is, the more one is tempted to turn one’s back on the environment. This means, preeminently, turning one’s back on “nature”—on traditions of nature feeling, traditions of knowledge about nature (ones that range from organic farming techniques to the different departments of ecological science), and traditions of nature-based activism. If nature is thoroughly wrecked these days, **people need to delink from nature** and live in postnature—a conclusion that, as the next chapter shows, many in U.S. society drew at the end of the millenium. Explorations of how deeply “nature” has been wounded and how intensely vulnerable to and dependent on human actions it is can thus lead, ironically, to **further indifference** to nature-based environmental issues, not greater concern with them. But what quickly becomes evident to any reflective consideration of the difficulties of crisis discourse is that all of these liabilities are in fact bound tightly up with one specific notion of environmental crisis—with 1960s- and 1970s-style environmental apocalypticism. Excessive concern about them does not recognize that crisis discourse as a whole has significantly changed since the 1970s. They remain inducements to look away from serious reflection on environmental crisis only if one does not explore how environmental crisis has turned of late from apocalypse to dwelling place. The apocalyptic mode had a number of prominent features: it was preoccupied with running out and running into walls; with scarcity and with the imminent rupture of limits; with actions that promised and temporally predicted imminent total meltdown; and with (often, though not always) the need for immediate “**total solution**.” **Thus doomsterism was its reigning mode; eco-authoritarianism** was a grave temptation; and as crisis was elaborated to show more and more severe deformations of nature, temptation increased to refute it, or give up, or even cut off ties to clearly terminal “nature.”

## 1NR

### Alt Causes

#### Their second 1ac card says that government action is both unnecessary and insufficient – private action solves

Uribe 12 (Monica Ortiz Uribe, is a public radio reporter based along the U.S./Mexico border in El Paso, Texas, Marketplace — World, 10/30/12, "NAFTA’s promise slowed by lack of border infrastructure", http://www.marketplace.org/topics/world/naftas-promise-slowed-lack-border-infrastructure-http://www.marketplace.org/topics/world/naftas-promise-slowed-lack-border-infrastructure | AK)

Lexington’s card begins

Every day, more than a billion dollars worth of goods moves across the border between Mexico and the United States. Trade between the two countries quintupled in the last two decades.¶ The World Trade Bridge in Laredo, Texas is the most important commercial crossing along the southern border. About one third of all goods traded between the U.S. and Mexico travel through this port of entry. That equals about 5,000 trucks per day moving everything from cornflakes, to weed eaters, to Volkswagen Beetles.¶ Gene Garza is in charge field operations in South Texas for U.S. Customs and Border Protection.¶ "World Trade Bridge was actually opened in April 2000," Garza said. "Prior to that there was no bridge here, there was nothing out here, this was just farm land."¶ The bridge is a testament to the post-NAFTA boom when most tariffs between the United States and Mexico were eliminated. Since NAFTA, the number of trucks crossing through Laredo has tripled. But even before this bridge celebrated its 10th birthday, traffic had already outgrown capacity.¶ Last year border authorities nearly doubled the number of lanes to 15. Still, wait times can be inconsistent, which is a problem for manufacturers.¶ Carlo Jose is a Mexican driver who has been crossing trucks through this border for seven years.¶ "Sometimes it's difficult sometimes you spend five to six hours to cross the border," Jose said.¶ A five-hour-plus wait time is a worse case scenario. On good days, drivers may wait just one hour. If they are accredited under a Customs and Border Protection Trusted Traveler Program their wait could be less than an hour.¶ The main hold up at the border is security. After the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, the inspection process at the border intensified. Every vehicle that crosses through U.S. borders is subject to a thorough screening. That could be an X-ray of both the truck and trailer, or a manual inspection where the entire contents of a trailer is unloaded and checked.¶ "We have to facilitate the commercial traffic coming in but we also have to make sure that our borders are secure," Garza said.¶ Infrastructure at the border also affects wait times. The biggest obstacle to updating the current ports of entry and building new ones is insufficient federal funding. It’s especially tough now when the country is recovering from an economic recession and Congress has failed to approve a new budget.¶ Chris Wilson researches binational trade for the Woodrow Wilson Center in Washington D.C.¶ “Customs and Border Protection has identified a $6 billion deficit between where we are now and where we need to be to keep up with all the people and goods that are flowing across the border everyday,” Wilson said.¶ There has been some progress. There’s a new commercial port of entry in Arizona and another under construction in West Texas. Other ports have added additional lanes and Trusted Traveler Programs have helped speed up inspection times. But it’s not enough. In the past two years binational trade has grown by a record 23 percent. Without the infrastructure to support that amount of trade, both countries lose out.¶ “It cuts into the competitiveness of manufacturing in North America," Wilson said. "It means that we have less jobs, less trade, less exports and those are things that are really important right now to our economy.”

Lexington’s card ends

In an effort to speed things along, some binational business leaders have begun to invest in infrastructure themselves.¶ ¶ "The truth of the matter is we cannot afford to wait for the federal government to allocate federal dollars for these important projects,” said Ruben Barrales, president of the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce.¶ One example of such a project is a privately funded non-commercial border crossing outside San Diego that's currently under construction. Once completed, it will link travelers directly to the Tijuana airport. It’s success may help determine the future of other privately funded commercial projects currently in the works.

#### Their third card has a litany of recommendations – none of them are the aff

Donohue and Zozaya 11 (Thomas Donohue, President and CEO of the US Chamber of Commerce, José Zozaya President American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, 2011, "Steps to a 21st Century U.S.-Mexico Border A U.S. Chamber of Commerce Border Report" online @ http://www.uschamber.com/sites/default/files/reports/2011\_us\_mexico\_report.pdf

Lexington’s card begins

Businesses rely on just-in-time inventory management ¶ and depend on predictability and speed in their supply ¶ chains. Consequently, supply chains are critical to ¶ businesses’ underlying value, growth potential, and ¶ economic competitiveness. In many cases, before a ¶ product is completed, it may have crossed the border ¶ numerous times, necessitating a swift crossing process. ¶ An efﬁ cient supply chain is a lifeline for economic ¶ cooperation and mutual prosperity, and it contributes ¶ to our two countries’ competitive advantage. ¶ Unfortunately, supply chains often come to a halt due ¶ to border delays, security concerns, and infrastructure ¶ constraints. These issues create an environment ¶ of uncertainty in the business community, and ¶ uncertainty is the enemy of investment, job creation, ¶ economic prosperity, and supply chain security. We ¶ need to address these issues together in order to grow ¶ our trade relationship. Solving these issues will take ¶ collaboration, and the solutions are both short and ¶ long term.¶ The business community is ﬁ nding that sometimes ¶ likely solutions to border congestion are not being ¶ tried or, once tried, implemented. Nevertheless, we ¶ are encouraged by a recent willingness by leadership ¶ at CBP to engage in pilots and test new innovative ¶ ways to approach the border. Industry recognizes the ¶ challenges that face regulators in reforming policy; ¶ however, more needs to be done.

Lexington’s card ends

Imports Equal Exports

Much discussion takes place today about the ability ¶ of U.S. companies to increase their exports. President ¶ Obama made this a national goal in the United ¶ States, calling for doubling the nation’s exports over ¶ the next ﬁ ve years. The Chamber supports this goal, ¶ and through its advocacy for open markets is working ¶ to ensure that it is achieved. However, policymakers ¶ should recognize, too, that exports sometimes rely ¶ on imports.

For example, year after year, the Boeing Corporation ¶ is the largest U.S. exporter by value. The company ¶ designs, manufactures, and sells commercial jetliners, ¶ satellites, military aircraft, and other products in a ¶ worldwide marketplace. The completion of its newest ¶ commercial aircraft, the 787 Dreamliner, is truly a ¶ marvel to behold and a point of pride for the company ¶ and the entire country.

While the Dreamliner is constructed in the United ¶ States, many of its parts come from all over the¶ world. Consequently, while Boeing is the country’s¶ eading exporter, it is also a top importer. Companies ¶ invest billions annually to ensure the security, safety, ¶ and speed of the products coming into the United ¶ States. The faster those products are brought to their ¶ manufacturing facilities, the faster Boeing exports its ¶ planes. In a just-in-time delivery environment, Boeing¶ relies on an efﬁ cient supply chain from countries¶ around the globe, including Mexio. In this high-¶ value, mass-scale production environment, inventory is¶ not an option. Trade facilitation is the only solution.

What to Do

In many instances, the solution to border congestion ¶ can be found in commonsense solutions. One ¶ solution, for example, is expanding the data available ¶ to businesses engaged in border trade so that truck ¶ drivers can determine which crossing to approach. ¶ This can only be done if all government agencies ¶ recognize and commit to a basic measure of border ¶ wait times and begin tracking them with benchmarks ¶ and clearly deﬁ ned goals.

Deﬁning goals will enable government agencies to ¶ review stafﬁ ng levels and processes to determine if ¶ internal operations are working properly and where ¶ delays may be occurring in the crossing process. ¶ Seasonal variations must be considered. For instance, ¶ in Nogales, Arizona, imports can total 1,600 trucks ¶ per day during the peak winter months of the produce ¶ season versus less than 500 trucks per day during the ¶ summer. The 2014 expansion of the port there has the ¶ potential to double capacity.

There are signiﬁ cant security beneﬁts to participating ¶ in the C-TPAT program, and we, therefore, support ¶ expansion of C-TPAT for all participants in the ¶ supply chain. The SAFE Port Act of 2006 (Public ¶ Law 109-447, enacted October 13, 2006) anticipated ¶ a C-TPAT program open to all that opted and were ¶ able to meet the criteria. The current criteria, however, ¶ eliminate all Third Party Logistics Providers (3PLs) ¶ that do not operate their own equipment.

3PLs in all modes play an essential role in selecting and ¶ managing the carriers that move freight across our land ¶ and sea borders. They provide information to customs ¶ authorities about the contents of the shipment and ¶ arrange for the loading of the truck and selection of the ¶ carrier. In many instances, they are physically present ¶ when the cargo is loaded. Consequently, 3PLs are often ¶ involved with the supply chain from the product’s point ¶ of origin or consolidation point to destination.

C-TPAT should, therefore, be inclusive of 3PLs. By ¶ excluding them, we are failing to capture the security ¶ beneﬁ ts of legitimate businesses willing to invest their ¶ own capital to secure our borders. Additionally, the ¶ European Union Authorized Economic Operator ¶ (AEO) program currently certiﬁ es non-asset-based ¶ 3PLs. As we move toward mutual recognition, which ¶ is a positive goal, this inconsistency will have to be ¶ rectiﬁ ed.

Other solutions are more long term and require ¶ coordination between the private sector and the ¶ government. One of those solutions includes ¶ expanding and attracting more participants into ¶ C-TPAT. CBP and the private sector have worked ¶ together to build a strong partnership to promote ¶ a secure supply chain. The C-TPAT program is ¶ recognized by all parties as working to achieve security ¶ around the world. CBP should explore opportunities ¶ to expand the program and attract greater ¶ participation.

These opportunities include the following:

• Develop commercial beneﬁ ts for all participants ¶ to justify the cost of membership.

• Develop a trusted shipper program for small and ¶ medium-size businesses.

• Establish pilot programs for less-than-truck load ¶ carriers, non-asset third-party logistics providers, ¶ and low-risk food importers subject to regulation ¶ outside of the regulatory authority of CBP.

• Help the Mexican government develop a trusted ¶ shipper program, along the lines of C-TPAT and ¶ Partners in Protection (PIP).

• Provide Tier III status for all participants in the ¶ C-TPAT program, not just importers.

• Develop a cooperative approach to law-abiding ¶ highway carriers entangled in a supply chain ¶ security breach.

• Evaluate the Free and Secure Trade (FAST) ¶ lanes to ensure that congestion does not block ¶ entrances to the designated lanes prior to the ¶ port of entry.

• Allow C-TPAT carriers to move shipments ¶ inland to their bonded warehouses for processing ¶ before the entries are submitted to CBP. The ¶ shipments would remain in complete control of ¶ the carrier that would sort out the small volume ¶ that requires CBP inspections (nonsecurity) and ¶ move them back to the border if necessary.

#### Fourth card says intel and a VTT program are key – not the aff – also says security is bad which means the aff goes the wrong direction

Leone 12 (Christopher Leone, Cronkite News, 6/1/12, "Panel says U.S.-Mexico border issues hinder huge economic opportunities" <http://cronkitenewsonline.com/2012/06/panel-says-u-s-mexico-border-issues-hinder-huge-economic-opportunities/>) WE REJECT ANY ABLEIST LANGUAGE

The U.S.-Mexico border holds a huge opportunity for increased trade and job creation, but it has become increasingly difficult to develop those opportunities since 2000, experts said Friday.

Increased security has caused a “thickening” of the border, ~~handicapping~~ businesses and tourists with long delays, said Christopher Wilson of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

Lexington’s card begins

“Border friction costs us,” Wilson said. “We don’t have to give up security to get efficiency, or efficiency to get security.”

He was one of a group of panelists from the government, academic and private sectors who met Friday at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in advance of a series of visits to key border sites next week.

The five days of visits, beginning Monday, will include meetings with public officials and businesses on both sides of the border, to get a close-up look at how trade actually happens each day along the 2,000-mile Southwest boundary.

“The Mexico border region is one of the wealthiest areas on the planet, maybe the fourth-largest economy in the world,” said Erik Lee, associate director of the North American Center for Transborder Studies at Arizona State University.

But Lee and Wilson, who co-authored a report on transborder economics that was released Friday, said there are numerous obstacles to developing that economy.

On top of stepped-up security efforts, Wilson said, deteriorating roads, bridges and ports of entry have added hours to the time it takes businesses and tourists to cross. Those delays have caused some business to move operations to Asia, according to their report.

“We are way behind in constructing infrastructure to facilitate trade along the U.S.-Mexico border,” said Lee, adding that there is as much as $6 billion in backlogged maintenance to that infrastructure.

Lexington’s card ends

He said U.S. manufacturing, tourism and retail businesses would feel a significant boost if the infrastructure were brought up to par.

Wilson also said there is a greater need for “security intelligence” and a voluntary trusted-traveler program for frequent border crossers. He pointed out that 85 percent of Mexican tourists come through land ports of entry.

“A border trusted-traveler program can shrink the haystack that border agents have to sift through, with intelligence offered voluntarily,” Wilson said.

### China

#### No China-Taiwan war – empirics

**McCarthy 4** (Daniel McCarthy, lawyer in Salt Lake City, Utah, former resident of Taiwan, China traveler, US-Chinese businessman, and student of military affairs and of US-China-Taiwan relations; “Ignore the rhetoric, China won't attack Taiwan,” 2004, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/China/FB11Ad06.html)

Over the past several years, reports of China threatening to attack Taiwan have become commonplace. The Chinese government has repeatedly and consistently pronounced that it would attack Taiwan under several conditions: If Taiwan declares independence. If foreign troops are present on Taiwan. If Taiwan develops a nuclear device. If Taiwan delays "reunification". The stridency of China's threats against Taiwan is impressive indeed. The message comes through loud and clear in the English-language media, and it is even more pointed in the domestic Chinese media, in which photographs of Chinese jet fighters and tanks accompany articles warning that Taiwan's leaders are heading into the abyss of war. On the surface, all of this could be quite convincing - China intends to use military force against Taiwan if any of the above conditions are met. But looks can be very deceiving. Most of China's conditions for war against Taiwan have already been met - and there is even plausible speculation about a nuclear device. But no war has occurred, nor is it likely to take place. Here is an examination of China's four conditions.

### Deterrence

#### Moore is wrong – incentive theory doesn’t explain war and causes violence

**Goodman ‘5** (Ryan, Harvard Law School, “International Institutions and the Mechanisms of War” American Journal of International Law lexis)

John Norton Moore’s Solving the War Puzzle raises important issues for fashioning institutions to prevent war. The book presents a detailed argument supporting two strategies -- democracy promotion and deterrence. Moore highlights the proper analytic question: what mechanisms motivate states to initiate war? As a methodological matter, Moore does well to ground this inquiry in empirical evidence. He ultimately proposes an "incentive theory," in which the political and material self-interest of governmental leaders is central to an account of the causes of war. This explanation, however, involves an unduly restrictive view of the reasons for which states wage war. The theory provides a **thin conception** of human motivation. The theory neither adequately explains the behavioral regularities that Moore identifies nor accounts for other patterns of international armed conflict. Contrary to Moore’s analysis, an array of recent theoretical and empirical studies -- some of which are used by Moore, and some not -- suggests the potential significance of mechanisms that are not grounded in incentives.

Identifying these mechanisms is essential to designing a coherent and effective international regime. Each mechanism supports democracy promotion (albeit for different reasons), yet some may conflict with particular deterrence-based strategies. At a fundamental level, each mechanism suggests distinct, and often competing, views of how to influence states. Consequently, strategies that exploit one mechanism can stifle the effects of another. Thus, while Moore’s general approach is commendable, the broader empirical literature and competing conceptual models pose considerable challenges to his theoretical claims and policy prescriptions. Until the mechanisms, and relationships between them, are better understood, we are unlikely to approach a solution to the war puzzle. Indeed, institutions and actors that pay inadequate attention to these dynamics may hamper, rather than enhance, the prospects of peace.

#### Linearity fails in IR fails

Bernstein et al 2000 Steven Bernstein, Richard Ned Lebow, Janice Gross Stein and Steven Weber, University of Toronto, The Ohio State University, University of Toronto and University of California at Berkeley. “God Gave Physics the Easy Problems” European Journal of International Relations 2000; 6; 43

A deep irony is embedded in the history of the scientific study of international relations. Recent generations of scholars separated policy from theory to gain an intellectual distance from decision-making, in the belief that this would enhance the 'scientific' quality of their work. But five decades of well-funded efforts to develop theories of international relations have produced precious little in the way of useful, high confidence results. Theories abound, but few meet **the most relaxed** 'scientific' tests of validity. Even the most robust generalizations or laws we can state - war is more likely between neighboring states, weaker states are less likely to attack stronger states - **are close to trivial**, have important exceptions, and for the most part stand outside any consistent body of theory. A generation ago, we might have excused our performance on the grounds that we were a young science still in the process of defining problems, developing analytical tools and collecting data. This excuse is neither credible nor sufficient; there is no reason to suppose that another 50 years of well-funded research would result in anything resembling a valid theory in the Popperian sense. We suggest that **the nature, goals and criteria for judging social science theory should be rethought**, if theory is to be more helpful in understanding the real world. We begin by justifying our pessimism, both conceptually and empirically, and argue that the quest for *predictive* theory rests on a mistaken analogy between physical and social phenomena. Evolutionary biology is a more productive analogy for social science. We explore the value of this analogy in its 'hard' and 'soft' versions, and examine the implications of both for theory and research in international relations.2 We develop the case for forward 'tracking' of international relations on the basis of local and general knowledge as an alternative to backward-looking attempts to build deductive, nomothetic theory. We then apply this strategy to some emerging trends in international relations. This article is not a nihilistic diatribe against 'modern' conceptions of social science. Rather, it is a plea for constructive humility in the current context of attraction to deductive logic, falsifiable hypothesis and large-n statistical 'tests' of narrow propositions. We propose a practical alternative for social scientists to pursue in addition, and in a complementary fashion, to 'scientific' theory-testing. *Newtonian Physics: A Misleading Model* Physical and chemical laws make two kinds of predictions. Some phenomena - the trajectories of individual planets - can be predicted with a reasonable degree of certainty. Only a few variables need to be taken into account and they can be measured with precision. Other mechanical problems, like the break of balls on a pool table, while subject to deterministic laws, are inherendy unpredictable because of their complexity. Small differences in the lay of the table, the nap of the felt, the curvature of each ball and where they make contact, amplify the variance of each collision and lead to what appears as a near random distribution of balls. Most predictions in science are probabilistic, like the freezing point of liquids, the expansion rate of gases and all chemical reactions. Point predictions appear possible only because of the large numbers of units involved in interactions. In the case of nuclear decay or the expansion of gases, we are talking about *trillions* of atoms and molecules. In international relations, even more than in other domains of social science, it is often **impossible** to assign metrics to what we think are relevant variables (Coleman, 1964: especially Chapter 2). The concepts of **polarity**, relative power and the **balance of power** are among the most widely used independent variables, **but there are no commonly accepted definitions or measures** for them. Yet without consensus on definition and measurement, almost every statement or hypothesis will have too much wiggle room to be 'tested' decisively against evidence. What we take to be dependent variables fare little better. Unresolved controversies rage over the definition and evaluation of **deterrence outcomes**, and about the criteria for **democratic** **governance** and their application to specific countries at different points in their history. Differences in coding for even a few cases have significant implications for tests of theories of deterrence or of the democratic peace (Lebow and Stein, 1990; Chan, 1997). The lack of consensus about terms and their measurement is **not merely the result of** intellectual anarchy or **sloppiness** - although the latter cannot entirely be dismissed. Fundamentally, **it has more to do with the arbitrary nature of the concepts themselves.** Key terms in physics, like mass, temperature and velocity, refer to aspects of the physical universe that we cannot directly observe. However, they are embedded in theories with deductive implications that have been verified through empirical research. Propositions containing these terms are legitimate assertions about reality because their truth-value can be assessed. Social science theories are for the most part built on **'idealizations'**, that is, on concepts that cannot be anchored to observable phenomena through rules of correspondence. Most of these terms (e.g. rational actor, balance of power) are not descriptions of reality but **implicit 'theories'** about actors and **contexts that do not exist** (Hempel, 1952; Rudner, 1966; Gunnell, 1975; Moe, 1979; Searle, 1995: 68-72). The inevitable differences in interpretation of these concepts lead to different predictions in some contexts, and these outcomes may eventually produce widely varying futures (Taylor, 1985: 55). **If** problems of definition, measurement and coding could be resolved, we **would still find it** difficult, if not **impossible, to construct large enough samples** of comparable cases to permit statistical analysis. It is now almost generally accepted that in the analysis of the causes of wars, the **variation across time and the complexity of the interaction** among putative causes make the likelihood of a general theory **extraordinarily low**. Multivariate theories run into the problem of negative degrees of freedom, yet international relations rarely generates data sets in the high double digits. Where larger samples do exist, they often group together cases that differ from one another in theoretically important ways.3 Complexity in the form of multiple causation and equifinality can also make simple statistical comparisons misleading. But it is hard to elaborate more sophisticated statistical tests until one has a deeper baseline understanding of the nature of the phenomenon under investigation, as well as the categories and variables that make up candidate causes (Geddes, 1990: 131-50; Lustick, 1996: 505-18; Jervis, 1997). Wars - to continue with the same example - are similar to chemical and nuclear reactions in that they have underlying and immediate causes. **Even when all the underlying conditions are present**, these processes generally require a catalyst to begin. Chain reactions are triggered by the decay of atomic nuclei. Some of the neutrons they emit strike other nuclei prompting them to fission and emit more neutrons, which strike still more nuclei. Physicists can calculate how many kilograms of Uranium 235 or Plutonium at given pressures are necessary to produce a chain reaction. They can take it for granted that if a 'critical mass' is achieved, a chain reaction will follow. This is because trillions of atoms are present, and at any given moment enough of them will decay to provide the neutrons needed to start the reaction. In a large enough sample, catalysts will be present in a statistical sense. **Wars involve relatively few actors.** Unlike the weak force responsible for nuclear decay, their catalysts are probably **not inherent properties** of the units. Catalysts may or may not be present, and their **potentially random distribution** relative to underlying causes makes it **difficult to predict when or if an appropriate catalyst will occur**. If in the course of time underlying conditions change, reducing basic incentives for one or more parties to use force, catalysts that would have triggered war will no longer do so. This uncertain and evolving relationship between underlying and immediate causes **makes point prediction extraordinarily difficult**. **It also makes more general statements about the causation of war problematic**, since we have **no way of knowing** what wars would have occurred in the presence of appropriate catalysts. It is probably impossible to define the universe of would-be wars or to construct a representative sample of them. Statistical inference requires knowledge about the state of independence of cases, but in a practical sense that knowledge is often **impossible to obtain in the analysis of international relations**.

### Renewables

#### Doublebind – either Mexican renewable energy is cheap and doesn’t qualify for state funding, or it’s expensive and never gets adopted

Lokey 11 (Elizabeth Lokey, Environmental Studies, University of Colorado, “Barriers to clean development mechanism renewable energy projects in Mexico”, Renewable Energy Vol. 34 Issue 3, 504-508, Science Direct | JJ)

The most significant hurdle to renewable energy development is that CFE, which controls most of the country's generation, currently cannot build renewable energy projects because the levelized cost of all types of renewable energy in the country is more expensive than conventional energy. According to federal law, CFE must develop new capacity additions that will provide the cheapest electricity for citizens. Currently, there are no regulatory mandates like domestic renewable energy targets or financial incentives like feed-in tariffs, which offer generators a fixed price for renewable energy based on installed capacity or energy produced, or production tax credits, which provide extra revenue per kWh of renewable energy produced, to make this type of generation competitive with fossil-fuel based generation. Also, in the planning process for new capacity additions, there is no incorporation of a future carbon tax, which would make renewables more competitive with conventional energy. The revenue that can be derived from the CDM for renewable energy projects is also not a part of the economic analysis made when considering new capacity additions [16]. If a project does not pass the financial analysis and get selected as the least-cost technology, then it is not published in the long-term planning process book that is presented before Congress and passed yearly. Capacity additions that are not in this book will not be considered for CFE development. However, if renewable energy is found to be the least-cost option and published in the long-term planning book, then this renewable energy would most likely not qualify for CDM revenues because it would fail both financial and regulatory additionality tests, which require that the project cause emission reductions beyond what would have occurred in a business-as-usual scenario [16].

### Too Late

#### Existing carbon triggers the impact

Daniel **Rirdan 12**, founder of The Exploration Company, “The Right Carbon Concentration Target”, June 29, <http://theenergycollective.com/daniel-rirdan/89066/what-should-be-our-carbon-concentration-target-and-forget-politics?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=The+Energy+Collective+%28all+posts%29>

James Hansen and other promi­nent cli­ma­tol­o­gists are call­ing to bring the CO2 atmos­pheric level to 350 parts per million. In fact, an orga­ni­za­tion, 350.org, came around that ral­ly­ing cry. This is far more radical than most politicians are willing to entertain. And it is not likely to be enough. The 350ppm target will not reverse the clock as far back as one may assume. It was in 1988 that we have had these level of car­bon con­cen­tra­tion in the air. But wait, there is more to the story. 1988-levels of CO2 with 2012-levels of all other green­house gases bring us to a state of affairs equiv­a­lent to that around 1994 (2.28 w/m2). And then there are aerosols. There is good news and bad news about them. The good news is that as long as we keep spewing mas­sive amounts of particulate matter and soot into the air, more of the sun’s rays are scattered back to space, over­all the reflec­tiv­ity of clouds increases, and other effects on clouds whose over­all net effect is to cool­ing of the Earth sur­face. The bad news is that once we stop polluting, stop run­ning all the diesel engines and the coal plants of the world, and the soot finally settles down, the real state of affairs will be unveiled within weeks. Once we fur­ther get rid of the aerosols and black car­bon on snow, we may be very well be worse off than what we have had around 2011 (a pos­si­ble addi­tion of 1.2 w/m2). Thus, it is not good enough to stop all green­house gas emis­sions. In fact, it is not even close to being good enough. A carbon-neutral econ­omy at this late stage is an unmit­i­gated disaster. There is a need for a carbon-negative economy. Essentially, it means that we have not only to stop emitting, to the tech­no­log­i­cal extent pos­si­ble, all green­house gases, but also capture much of the crap we have already out­gassed and lock it down. And once we do the above, the ocean will burp its excess gas, which has come from fos­sil fuels in the first place. So we will have to draw down and lock up that carbon, too. We have taken fos­sil fuel and released its con­tent; now we have to do it in reverse—hundreds of bil­lions of tons of that stuff.

e year 3000, said Solomon, who conducted the study with colleagues in Switzerland and France.

### Util

#### Utilitarian calculability justifies mass atrocity and turns its own end

Weizman 11 (Eyal Weizman, professor of visual and spatial cultures at Goldsmiths, University of London, 2011, “The Least of All Possible Evils: Humanitarian Violence from Arendt to Gaza,” pp 8-10)

The theological origins of the lesser evil argument cast a long shadow on the present. In fact the idiom has become so deeply ingrained, and is invoked in such a staggeringly diverse set of contexts – from individual situational ethics and international relations, to attempts to govern the economics of violence in the context of the ‘war on terror’ and the efforts of human rights and humanitarian activists to manoeuvre through the paradoxes of aid – that it seems to have altogether taken the place previously reserved for the ‘good’. Moreover, the very evocation of the ‘good’ seems to everywhere invoke the utopian tragedies of modernity, in which evil seemed lurking in a horrible manichaeistic inversion. If no hope is offered in the future, all that remains is to insure ourselves against the risks that it poses, to moderate and lessen the collateral effects of necessary acts, and tend to those who have suffered as a result. In relation to the ‘war on terror,’ the terms of the lesser evil were most clearly and prominently articulated by former human rights scholar and leader of Canada’s Liberal Party Michael Ignatieff. In his book *The Lesser Evil*, Ignatieff suggested that in ‘balancing liberty against security’ liberal states establish mechanisms to regulate the breach of some human rights and legal norms, and allow their security services to engage in forms of extrajudicial violence – which he saw as lesser evils – in order to fend off or minimize potential greater evils, such as terror attacks on civilians of western states.11 If governments need to violate rights in a terrorist emergency, this should be done, he thought, only as an exception and according to a process of adversarial scrutiny. ‘Exceptions’, Ignatieff states, ‘do not destroy the rule but save it, provided that they are temporary, publicly justified, and deployed as a last resort.’12 The lesser evil emerges here as a pragmatist compromise, a ‘tolerated sin’ that functions as the very justification for the notion of exception. State violence in this model takes part in a necro-economy in which various types of destructive measure are weighed in a utilitarian fashion, not only in relation to the damage they produce, but to the harm they purportedly prevent and even in relation to the more brutal measures they may help restrain. In this logic, the problem of contemporary state violence resembles indeed an all-too-human version of the mathematical minimum problem of the divine calculations previously mentioned, one tasked with determining the smallest level of violence necessary to avert the greater harm. For the architects of contemporary war this balance is trapped between two poles: keeping violence at a low enough level to limit civilian suffering, and at a level high enough to bring a decisive end to the war and bring peace.13 More recent works by legal scholars and legal advisers to states and militaries have sought to extend the inherent elasticity of the system of legal exception proposed by Ignatieff into ways of rewriting the laws of armed conflict themselves.14 Lesser evil arguments are now used to defend anything from targeted assassinations and mercy killings, house demolitions, deportation, torture,15 to the use of (sometimes) non-lethal chemical weapons, the use of human shields, and even ‘the intentional targeting of some civilians if it could save more innocent lives than they cost.’16 In one of its more macabre moments it was suggested that the atomic bombings of Hiroshima might also be tolerated under the defence of the lesser evil. Faced with a humanitarian A-bomb, one might wonder what, in fact, might come under the definition of a greater evil. Perhaps it is time for the differential accounting of the lesser evil to replace the mechanical bureaucracy of the ‘banality of evil’ as the idiom to describe the most extreme manifestations of violence. Indeed, it is through this use of the lesser evil that societies that see themselves as democratic can maintain regimes of occupation and neo-colonization. Beyond state agents, those practitioners of lesser evils, as this book claims, must also include the members of independent nongovernmental organizations that make up the ecology of contemporary war and crisis zones. The lesser evil is the argument of the humanitarian agent that seeks military permission to provide medicines and aid in places where it is in fact the duty of the occupying military power to do so, thus saving the military limited resources. The lesser evil is often the justification of the military officer who attempts to administer life (and death) in an ‘enlightened’ manner; it is sometimes, too, the brief of the security contractor who introduces new and more efficient weapons and spatio-technological means of domination, and advertises them as ‘humanitarian technology’. In these cases the logic of the lesser evil opens up a thick political field of participation belonging together otherwise opposing fields of action, to the extent that it might obscure the fundamental moral differences between these various groups. But, even according to the terms of an economy of losses and gains, the conception of the lesser evil risks becoming counterproductive: less brutal measures are also those that may be more easily naturalized, accepted and tolerated – and hence more frequently used, with the result that a greater evil may be reached cumulatively, Such observations amongst other paradoxes are unpacked in one of the most powerful challenges to ideas such as Ignatieff’s – Adi Ophir’s philosophical essay *The Order of Evils*. In this book Ophir developed an ethical system that is similarly not grounded in a search for the ‘good’ but the systemic logic of an economy of violence – the possibility of a lesser means and the risk of more damage – but insists that questions of violence are forever unpredictable and will always escape the capacity to calculate them. Inherent in Ophir’s insistence on the necessity of calculating is, he posits, the impossibility of doing so. The demand of his ethics are grounded in this impossibility.17