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**Off**

**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.

**China threats are products of narcissistic understandings of the U.S.’s role in global politics – it results in containment which un-brackets war**

**Pan, 4** – PhD in Political Science and International Relations and member of the International Studies Association ISA (Chengxin Pan: Alternatives: Global, Local, Political, Vol. 29 Pg. 305 -307)

I have argued above that the "China threat" argument in main­stream U.S. IR literature is derived, primarily, from a discursive construction of otherness. This construction is predicated on a particular narcissistic understanding of the U.S. self and on a posi­tivist-based realism, concerned with absolute certainty and security, a concern central to the dominant U.S. self-imaginary. Within these frameworks,it seems imperative that China be treated as a threatening, absolute other since it is unable to fit neatly into the U.S.-led evolutionary scheme or guarantee absolute security for the United States, so that U.S. power preponderanc**e** in the post–Cold War world can still be legitimated. Not only does this reductionist representation come at the expense of understanding China as a dynamic, multifaceted coun­try but it leads inevitably to a policy of containment that, in turn, tends to enhance the influence of realpolitik thinking, nationalist extremism, andhard-line stance in today's China. Even a small dose of the containment strategy is likely to have a highly dramatic impact on U.S.-China relations**,** as the 1995-1996 missile crisis and the 2001 spy-plane incident have vividly attested. In this respect, Chalmers Johnson is right when he suggests that "a policy of con­tainment toward China implies the possibility of war, just as it did during the Cold War vis-a-vis the former Soviet Union. The balance of terror prevented war between the United States and the Soviet Union, but this may not work in the case of China."93

**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 and 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.

**Solvency**

**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**

**No internal link to microgrids – they have the causality BACKWARDS – microgrids facilitate adoption of renewable energy, not the other way around**

**No risk of nuclear meltdown and their impact is academic garbage**

**NEI 12**, Nuclear Energy Institute, “Myths & Facts About Nuclear Energy”, June, http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/documentlibrary/reliableandaffordableenergy/factsheet/myths--facts-about-nuclear-energy-january-2012/

Fact: If this claim were true, it would be dangerous to breathe air or eat food. Every human being is continuously exposed to different forms of radiation every moment of their life. In fact, the use of radiation in medicine, electricity generation and many other common applications has improved, extended and saved the lives of millions of Americans. Studies by the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, the National Research Council’s BEIR VII study group and the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements all show that the risk associated with low-dose radiation from natural and man-made sources, including nuclear power plants, is **extremely small**. Researchers with the U.S. Department of Energy’s Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, through a combination of state-of-the-art time-lapse live imaging and mathematical modeling of a special line of human breast cells, found evidence that for low-dose levels of ionizing radiation, cancer risks may not be directly proportional to dose. The data show that at lower doses of ionizing radiation, DNA repair mechanisms work much better than at higher doses. This contradicts the standard model for predicting biological damage from ionizing radiation—the linear-no-threshold hypothesis or LNT—which holds that risk is directly proportional to dose at all levels of irradiation. Dr. James Conca addressed LNT in a recent Forbes article. Conca is an international expert on the environmental effects of radiological and chemical contamination and the 9 determination of risk at low doses of radiation. Radiation is strictly controlled and monitored at all nuclear power plants to minimize plant emissions and worker exposure. Less than one-tenth of a percent of all radiation exposure is from nuclear facilities as confirmed by widespread radiation monitoring programs that ensure the safety of plant workers and neighbors. For more information about radiation, visit www.radiationanswers.org. Nuclear plants emit dangerous amounts of radiation. Fact: Nuclear power plants have controlled and monitored emissions of radiation, but the amount is extremely small and poses no threat to the public or the environment. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission reports that people living close to a nuclear power plant receive, at most, an additional one millirem of radiation exposure a year. To put this in perspective, one millirem is one thousandth of the radiation exposure from a single whole-body CAT scan. The average American is exposed to 620 millirem of radiation every year. Three hundred millirem comes from natural sources, such as cosmic rays, uranium in the Earth’s crust and radon gas in the atmosphere. Most of the rest comes from medical procedures such as CAT scans and consumer products. The radiation exposure from living near a nuclear power plant is insignificant and is no threat to the health of the public. After more than 3,600 reactor years of operation, there is no scientific or medical evidence that shows anyone has been harmed by the radiation from any of America’s commercial nuclear energy facilities, including the accident at Three Mile Island 32 years ago. The radiation from nuclear plants causes cancer and other harmful effects. Fact: After more than a half-century of radiological monitoring and medical research, there is no evidence linking U.S. nuclear energy plants to negative effects on the health of the public or workers. Claims that radioactivity from nuclear plants has caused negative health effects have been refuted by the United Nations Scientific Committee of the Effects of Atomic Radiation, National Research Council’s BEIR VII study group, the National Cancer Institute, the American Cancer Society, the American Academy of Pediatrics, numerous state departments of health and other independent studies.

**Their rhetoric of peacekeeping is mere Bush-style whitewashing of mass violence**

**Porotsky 13** (Sophia Porotsky, MA honors candidate in international relations at the University of St Andrews, April 26th, 2013, “Pax Americana: The Successful Securitization of the Triple Threat of Terrorism, “Outlaw” Regimes, and Weapons of Mass Destruction,” http://www.academia.edu/3482477/Pax\_Americana\_The\_Successful\_Securitization\_of\_the\_Triple\_Threat\_of\_Terrorism\_Outlaw\_Regimes\_and\_Weapons\_of\_Mass\_Destruction) gz

Transforming the semantics of an act involves “replacing unpleasant reality with desirable rhetoric, gilding the frame so that the real picture is disguised” (Zimbardo, 2009: 273). The use of sanitizing or euphemistic language is ubiquitous in the government texts. For example, Bush declares: ¶ “We will use our position of unparalleled strength and influence to build an atmosphere of international order and openness in which progress and liberty can flourish in many nations. A peaceful world of growing freedom serves American long-term interests, reflects enduring American ideals, and unites America’s allies. We defend this peace by opposing and preventing violence by terrorists and outlaw regimes” (Bush, 2002d).¶ In this excerpt Bush cloaks military action with euphemistic statements such as ‘building an atmosphere of international order and openness’ and ‘defending the peace,’ he sanitizes the means by accentuating the morally justifiable ends of ‘peace’, ‘order’, and ‘openness’. Tapping into the political myth of American Exceptionalism, Bush justifies the end goal by framing it as a cause for the greater good of the world. Bandura expands on the effects of sanitizing language and euphemistic labeling stating:¶ “Language shapes thought patterns on which actions are based. Activities can take on very different appearances depending on what they are called…euphemistic language is widely used to make harmful conduct respectable and to reduce personal responsibility for it…people behave much more cruelly when assaultive actions are verbally sanitized than when they are called aggression” (Bandura, 1999: 195). ¶ This statement substantiates the claim that adopting a particular discourse when describing violent action disguises the true meaning of the act, while simultaneously reinforcing the justifications from the War on Terrorism narrative. A further example can be found in Bush’s Address to the Nation where he asserts:¶ “These carefully targeted actions are designed to disrupt the use of Afghanistan as a terrorist base of operations…Our military action is also designed to clear the way for sustained, comprehensive and relentless operations to drive them out and bring them to justice…As we strike military targets, we’ll also drop food, medicine and supplies to the starving and suffering men and women and children of Afghanistan” (Bush, 2001k).¶ Describing military actions as ‘carefully targeted’ implies that the army is striking only military targets with surgical precision; it encourages people to overlook any ‘collateral damage,’ a euphemism for civilian casualties, in the process. Additionally, Bush excuses the implicit collateral damage by demonstrating the benevolence of the United States. Dropping humanitarian aid compensates for the consequences of military action. Bush then reinforces the benevolent image of the United States by tapping into discourses of women and children and suffering, assigning the role of savior of the Afghan people to the United States. The altered semantics of this act is revealed upon a comparison of the reality on the ground versus the narrative Bush was constructing. While Bush claimed that the military campaign in Afghanistan was ‘carefully targeted’ and ‘precise,’ in reality the military was carpet bombing Afghanistan using cluster bombs (Lee, 2005: 279). Carpet bombing can be understood as “the progressive distribution of a mass bomb load upon an area…in such a manner as to inflict damage to all portions within the boundaries” (Keane, 2005: 30). Thus, carpet bombing by definition is indiscriminate, the polar opposite of ‘carefully targeted’ or ‘precise.’ Moreover, cluster bombs “disperse large numbers of explosive submunitions over wide areas and often fail to explode immediately, leaving a long-term legacy of explosive contamination” (International Committee of the Red Cross, 2009). Cluster bombs in particular have provoked international criticism due to their “unique characteristics that make them a grave danger to civilian men, women and children… causing high civilian casualties especially when they are used in populated areas… Many thousands of civilians have been tragically killed and injured by coming into contact with unexploded submunitions” (International Committee of the Red Cross, 2009). Thus, the narrative Bush was constructing could not be further from the reality. While Bush was highlighting the benevolence and good will of the US, the US military was inflicting the maximum amount of indiscriminate damage. Ironically, the humanitarian aid packages Bush was referring to were the same bright yellow color as the unexploded cluster bomblets (Lee, 2005: 279), further endangering civilians who could easily mistake the submunitions for food or medicine. Bush obscuring the sordid realities and stressing the good will of the US contributes to moral justification, which is essential for the American public acceptance of securitization. Moral justifications are a requisite of moral disengagement, since these justifications are the basis on which morally reprehensible acts are perpetrated.

**Reform**

**Renewables worsen the quality of life for the poor**

**Cecelski, 2k** – (Elizabeth, worked for more than twenty-five years in problems of energy and developing countries, specializing in energy, poverty and gender issues, especially in household and rural energy; and in rural electrification and rural development; holds a BA from Duke University and an MA from John Hopkins.¶ As an energy economist at Resources for the Future, she co-authored Household Energy and the Third World Poor (1979) and Energy Strategies for Developing Nations (1981). She later worked for an appropriate technology NGO, VITA, and in the Rural Employment Policies Branch of the International Labour Organisation in Geneva. She is a founding member, and presently member of the Advisory Group and Technical Adviser for Advocacy & Research of ENERGIA, the International Network on Gender and Sustainable Energy, and is the author of several standard references on gender and energy; “ENABLING EQUITABLE ACCESS TO RURAL ¶ ELECTRIFICATION: CURRENT THINKING AND MAJOR ACTIVITIES IN ENERGY, POVERTY AND GENDER,” 27 January 2000, http://www.sarpn.org/genderenergy/resources/cecelski/energypovertygender.pdf//HO

Sustainable energy development (SED) has been defined as sustainability in economic, ¶ social and environmental terms (deLucia, 1992; Munasinghe, 1995). Renewable energy ¶ and energy efficiency are usually characterized as "win-win" options in SED, meeting the ¶ objectives both of environmental improvement and poverty alleviation (with economics ¶ being the principal challenge). ¶ It is increasingly clear however that this is unlikely to be true in every case. The situation ¶ is considerably more complicated. Any technology when applied in a field situation ¶ represents gains and losses for different groups. More likely, there are "win-win" ¶ situations, "win-lose" situations, and "trade-offs" between environmental objectives and ¶ poverty reduction, to use a framework proposed by Munasinghe (1995)1¶ . ¶ A recent review of renewable energy activities in ESMAP (1999) points out that¶ The 'mainstreaming' of 'renewable energy' is not an end in itself, but is a means to ¶ satisfying two objectives namely the objective to reduce poverty and the objective to ¶ reduce global environmental damage that results from energy use. Under current ¶ incentive structures there will frequently be a trade off between these two objectives.¶ and concludes that although ¶ renewables may be the best choice in some circumstances, restricting support to ¶ renewable energy sources alone places severe additional burdens on poor people, ¶ and denies them the opportunity for productivity growth that fossil fuelled ¶ technologies facilitate.

**Renewable assistance to Mexico pads corporate coffers, while robbing the inhabitants of their land**

**Pasqualetti 11** (Martin J. Pasqualetti, Senior Sustainability Scientist, Global Institute of Sustainabillity, 5/25/2011, “Social Barriers to Renewable Energy Landscapes”, Wiley Online Library | JJ) GENDER MODIFIED BECAUSE JJ DOESN’T KNOW WHAT PRONOUNS ARE

\*Oaxaca – wa-ha-kah

The ultimate scale of development will rely on several factors other than raw wind strength and consistency. Much will depend on siting choices and cooperation between developers and local residents. **Current plans** are to concentrate the wind farms near the rural communities of La Venta and La Ventosa, northeast of Juchitán (Stevenson 2009). This could be a **portentous choice**. Founded in 1486, Juchitán is now home to about 75,000 citizens, mostly Zapotecs and Huaves. It is also the seat of the Coalición Obrera, Campesina, Estudiantil del Istmo, an inﬂuential popular movement that matured in the 1970s combining socialists, peasants, students, and indigenous groups (COCEI 2010). The relative ease of passage through the low-lying region of the isthmus has contributed to its strategic value and the long history of occupation in Juchitán. Such long occupation has helped create a close association between the people and their land (O’Connor and Kroefges 2008), as well as substantial autonomy from the central government in Mexico City. The autonomy is reﬂected in the history of political unrest and activism common in this region. A revolt took place in 1834, and life was again interrupted by the Mexican-American War in 1847. Less than twenty years on, the people of Juchitán defeated the French. Porﬁrio Díaz, later a dictator of Mexico, populated his army mostly with citizens from Juchitán. In 1910 other natives of the town organized in support of the revolutionaries Pancho Villa and Emiliano Zapata. By 1980 Juchitán had attracted further attention by electing a left-wing, prosocialist municipal government, the ﬁrst Mexican community to do so in the twentieth century. In February 2001 Juchitán received the military caravan of the Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional. Many residents in the region clearly have an anarchist bent. Given this historical and cultural background, it is not surprising that the changes which accompany the introduction of wind power have met with some resistance. In recent years the tendency for citizen activism has evolved into increasingly common clashes, ones that pit locals against the federal government over plans to alter their sense of landscape permanence by installing wind megaprojects in the area. Among the contentions is that local residents are receiving meager compensation for leasing land to the wind developers.2 The reported amount has ranged from amounts equivalent to U.S. $51 per acre per year for a single turbine to U.S. $40–$48 per acre per year (Sanchez 2007; Hawley 2009). Others have reported the rate to be as low as U.S. $15 per year for 7.4 acres, as Karen Trejo reported in 2008: Faustina López Martínez, originally from the village of Juchitán, complained that the companies promised agriculture aid without ever following through. On the lands where she used to plant corn to sell, the Spanish company Union FENOSA plans to install windmills to generate wind energy for the next 30 years, and possibly extending to double the term. In exchange, López will receive 150 pesos (less than US $15) each year for the rent of each of her 3 hectares (7.4 acres) of land. Such disproportion is one of the principal reasons behind the formation of organizations such as the Grupo Solidario de la Venta, which are opposed to wind development in the isthmus (Girón-Carrasco 2007). This and other groups claim that the “government has been **violating the rights of indigenous peoples**, causing both **environmental and cultural destruction**; that the intent of . . . wind park construction is to turn the isthmus into an **industrial corridor**” (Sanchez 2007). These strong antiwind sentiments are being noticed in other wind-rich countries, including the Netherlands: “In Juchitán, in southern Mexico, the wind always blows. Very hard. Wind farms are springing up like mushrooms . . . to the great displeasure of the local Zapotec farmers. . . . Wind power projects on the Isthmus of Tehuantepec in southeastern Mexico harm land of Zapotecan farmers” (La Ruta). As in Massachusetts and Scotland, politics are playing an important and continuing role in Oaxaca. Developers, politicians, and officials of various government agencies in Mexico City have been peppered with questions of propriety, fairness, inﬂuence, and control. The public advocacy organization National Wind Watch oﬀers this explanation: “The growing resistance to wind farm construction in southern Oaxaca . . . is based on local landowners’ negative negotiating experiences with the CFE [the national electricity company], discomfort with the broad freedoms seemingly granted to multinational corporations and an increasing concern about the possible environmental consequences of the wind farms themselves” (Sanchez 2007,). “Are the ejidatarios being victimized?” asked a reporter from USA Today, at a public presentation at the Benjamin Franklin Library in Mexico City in June 2009 (Hawley 2009).3 A local leftist farm group known as the Asamblea en Defensa de la Tierra y el Territorio has complained about the treatment it has been receiving, saying: “They **promise progress and jobs**, and talk about millions in investment in clean energy from the winds that blow through our region, but the investments will **only beneﬁt business**~~men~~ [people], **all the technology will be imported** . . . **and the power won’t be for local inhabitants**” (Stevenson 2009). The group is calling on supporters to defend the land “inherited from our ancestors.” They have said “no to the wind energy megaproject in the isthmus that desecrates our lands and cultural heritage” (Sanchez 2007). Protestors have taken to the streets, and incidents of rock throwing, accompanied by minor injuries, have occurred. In addition, some groups have barricaded roads leading to wind sites; others have marched, holding antiwind banners (Figure 12). Most of the protests are over the loss of land: “The **Greedy Grabbers** need land, and lots of it, to be able to put up sticks and blades and thus seize and put a meter between the people and heaven itself” (Giordano 2006).

**Neoliberalism is the driving force of all impact scenarios**

**Deutsch, 9**

/Judith, president, Science for Peace. Member of Canadian psychoanalytic society, “Pestilence, Famine, War, Neoliberalism, and Premature Deaths,” *Peace Magazine*, http://peacemagazine.org/archive/v25n3p18.htm/

At present, threats to human existence come from at least four directions: climate change with its consequences of catastrophic climate events and of drastic water and food shortages; from nuclear war; from pandemics; from the severe impoverishment and destruction of society that is a result of neo-liberal restructuring. All are due to human error. All are preventable. But the time factor is most crucial around climate change. The lack of attention to the time scale is tantamount to believing that "it can't happen here."¶ Currently, most attempts to counter these dangers address the issues in isolation even though the main perpetrators implement a unified, relatively coherent programme that unites these threats. Neo-liberal plutocrats are the controlling shareholders of the large agri-business, weapons, water privatization, pharmaceutical (anti national health care), mining, non-renewable energy companies. It is their economic practices that decimate water resources, deplete soil, pollute air, and increase greenhouse gas emissions. The culpable individuals, their think tanks, the supportive government bureaucracies, and the specific methods of control are well-documented in a number of recent works.1¶ From recent history it is readily apparent that **mass extinction "can happen here."** A similar confluence of climate events and exploitive socio-economic re-structuring occurred in the late-Victorian period. Retrospective statistical studies established that worldwide droughts between 1876 and 1902 were caused by El Nino weather events. Based on the British Empire's laissez-faire approach to famine that enjoined against state "interference" in the for-profit trade in wheat, between 13 million and 29 million people died in India alone.¶ True to the precepts of liberalism, the British converted small subsistence farms in India into large scale monocrop farming for export on a world market. The new globally integrated grain trade meant that disturbances in distant parts of the world affected Indian farmers. Advances in technology actually made things worse, for steam-driven trains were used to transport grains to England while locals starved, and telegraph communication was used to process international monetary transactions that destroyed local communities. Gone were the traditional social institutions for managing food shortages and hardship.¶ The Victorian world view also bequeathed us the myth of the inferior Third World and denial of British responsibility for the de-development of tropical countries. Mike Davis points out the compelling evidence that South Indian laborers had higher earnings than their British counterparts in the 18th century and lived lives of greater financial security, including better diets and lower unemployment. "If the history of British rule in India were to be condensed into a single fact, it is this: there was no increase in India's per capita income from 1757 to 1947. Indeed, in the last half of the nineteenth century [due to colonial structural adjustment], income probably declined by more than 50% There was no economic development at all in the usual sense of the term."( Davis, p. 311).¶ In today's world, neo-liberalism continues to increase global misery and poverty and the dehumanization and invisibility of millions of "warehoused" people. Whatever conditions increase poverty also increase premature deaths. In the US, a 1% rise in unemployment increases the mortality rate by 2%, homicides and imprisonments by 6%, and infant mortality by 5%. The 225 richest individuals worldwide have a combined wealth of over $1 trillion, equal to the annual income of the poorest 47% of the world's population, or 2.5 billion people. By comparison, it is estimated that the additional cost of achieving and maintaining universal access to basic education for all, reproductive health care for all women, adequate food for all and safe water and sanitation for all is roughly $40 billion a year. This is less than 4% of the combined wealth of these 225 richest people.2¶ NEO-LIBERALISM¶ Neo-liberal policies have mandated the destruction of the social safety net that would be the lifesaver in climate disaster, epidemics, and war. The International Monetary Fund has required countless countries to dismantle public education, health, water, and sanitation infrastructure. Neo-liberalism strenuously opposes government intervention on behalf of the common good while hypocritically and deceptively protecting narrow class interests and investments in the military, non-renewable energy, privatized health care.¶ The powerful and wealthy few control the military-industrial complex, surveillance, and the media. The connections with climate change are manifold. Already there is military preparedness for the potential impacts on peace and security posed by climate change -- not to help victims but to keep refugees out. Ominously, there are now overt racist overtones to the discussion of "environmental refugees" and the closing of borders. The model of response to disasters is most likely Hurricane Katrina, namely, protection of the wealthy and outright cruelty to the poor.¶ Wars are tremendously costly to the public but highly profitable to powerful elites. "The arms trade has expanded by more than 20% worldwide in the past five years" (The Guardian Weekly 01.05.09, p. 11). The military itself emits enormous amounts of greenhouse gases and brutally protects the extractive industries of the wealthy. There are innumerable unreported incidents: In May 2009, alone, the Nigerian army razed villages in the oil-rich Niger delta to protect oil companies, killing many civilians; in Papua New Guinea, 200 heavily armed soldiers and police were sent to the Barrick Gold Porgera area to destroy indigenous villages. In the 20th century, it is estimated that as many as 360 million people died prematurely due to state terrorism--"terrorism from above."

**The affirmative’s developmental approach to resolving politics has been tried and failed – it only serves to inflict structural violence on populations while filling the pockets of elites**

**Nhanenge, 11** (Jytte Nhanenge, ecological and social activist, MA in development and MA in philosophy from the University of South Africa, extremely prominent theorist in development studies, 2011, “Ecofeminism: Towards Integrating the Concerns of Women, Poor People, and Nature into Development,” pp 19-22) gz

The official intention with establishing the development program in the South was to increase economic growth assumed necessary to alleviate poverty. However, there is no evidence that absolute poverty is decreasing; rather the reverse is the case. In addition, economic growth is declining. For economic growth and for almost all other development indicators, the 20 years as from 1980 to 2000 of the current form of economic globalization, have shown a clear decline in progress as compared with the previous two decades. In sub-Saharan Africa, per capita income fell by almost 25 percent during the 1980s. Investment has decreased with 50 percent, and export has decreased by 45 percent since 1980. The world’s low-income countries (2.4 billion people), account for just 2.4 percent of world export. External debt has risen from 10 billion USD in 1972 to 130 billion USD in 1987. Presently the Third World debt is around 500 billion USD. According to Shah, for every one USD the South receives in aid, it spends over twenty-five USD on debt repayment. In the poorest countries, it is commonly the people that did not enjoy the money, who are likely to pay the debt. Many development commentators find that lack of development is not causing these figures, rather development itself has brought about such impoverishment: when development turns natural resources, which provide a large number of people with decent subsistence livelihood, into industrial raw materials that benefit relatively few, then development creates poverty. (Ekins 1992; Naidoo 2009; Shah 2009b.)When development projects use the lands, soils, and waters of traditional people to produce commercial crop and industrial food for the market, then traditional people cannot anymore live from their natural resources. Moreover, major development projects often include removal of people from their traditional society into another social constellation with different norms where they cannot participate. The outcome of traditional people’s exposure to development is that they lose all, which gave meaning to them in their lives. Before development disposed them, they were not poor. They lived modest but self-sustaining lives from their environment. Their communities also considered them useful and productive members. However, when development diverted natural resources towards economic growth, people became poor and their natural resources became exhausted. From this, it follows that development destroys wholesome and sustainable lifestyles, creates scarcity of basic needs, excludes an increasing number of people from their entitlement to food, and generates real poverty or misery. Seen in this way, development is a threat for the survival of the great majority. Rather that being a strategy for poverty alleviation, development is consequently creating poverty and environmental destruction. (Ekins 1992; Shiva 1989, 1990.)One example is the World Bank sponsored Narmada Valley Project in India’s states of Gujarat Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra. The proposed two large dams will displace 200,000 mainly tribal people, with no prospect of giving them fertile land elsewhere. The organization Survival International suggests that the Indian government has not identified land for resettlement because there is no land available. Other people occupy almost all of the cultivatable land in the region; the remaining land is too poor for permanent farming. These people will therefore become development refugees living in the slumps of Bombay, like so many before them. Beneficiaries from the dam will be the better off landowners, who will receive water for irrigation. The hydro-electricity produced by the dam will benefit the industries and the urban middle class. Experience shows that the wealth, the increased productivity will create, does not trickledown to the poor. Rather the difference between rich and poor will increase and poverty will intensify. Provision of drinking water meant to benefit the poorest people in the most arid lands was a major justification for the dams. It is highly unlikely that the dam will ever deliver this necessity. (Ekins 1992; Elliot 1994)In 1990, some 70 ongoing projects of the World Bank were forcibly displacing 1.5 million people. In almost all the cases, the dispossessed will end up impoverished. This is because the so-called “resettlement and rehabilitation” process is highly inadequate. In Indonesia, the Kedung Ombo dam displaced 20,000 without compensation. The 12,500 dispossessed of the Ruzizi II dam on the Zaire/Rwanda border received inadequate compensation. Another example is Kenya’s Kiambere hydroelectric project. BBC News showed the project in April 2005. For the television presenter the project was an example of how development alleviates poverty by giving local people energy as a way out of their poverty. Nevertheless, according to Ekins the project displaced 6,000 local people without compensation. (Ekins, Hillman, and Hutchison 1992.)In order to justify the centralization of traditional people’s natural resources the governments argue that industrialization will not only use the natural resources but also provide jobs and thus income for people’s survival. However, this is only a theoretical model. Often industrialists cannot use the labor of the indigenous people, who in a modern perception are unskilled, and who frequently are also illiterate. Hence, what industries want is to use the fields, forests, fishes, and rivers on which the people subsist. Thus, in the name of progress and development, the governments appropriate these resources, hand them over to owners of industries, who turn them into market goods, which the dispossessed can never hope to buy. (Ekins, Hillman, and Hutchison 1992.)One should add that even if these people would get work, employment does not necessarily generate an escape from poverty. Average wages in the US fell with 9 percent from 1980 to 1989. In 1987, 31.5 percent of the working force was receiving poverty level pay. According to the Census Bureau, median household income in the United States fell to 50,303 USD in 2008, a drop of 3.6 percent. This is the biggest annual drop seen since the government started keeping records in 1947. In Africa, it is also common that farmers and industries employ people as daily labors. In this way, they can pay salaries that are below the official minimum level. The exploitation of poor people, by rich people is a widespread practice in African countries. Hence, the profit from industries is not benefitting workers; the owners direct the profit to themselves and their shareholders. (Dave Manual.com 2009; Ekins, Hillman, and Hutchison 1992.)The reason why development cannot alleviate poverty relates to the false trust in the “growth and trickle-down approach.” The conventional belief is that economic growth will generate wealth in society, which eventually will trickle-down to the poor segment, and thus alleviate poverty. The blind faith in this strategy comes from its ability to make significant improvements in average life expectancy, infant mortality, literacy, and Gross National Product. Based on this experience development aid from the North is directed to increase economic growth in the South. However, what experts overlook, is the model’s inherent side effect of inequality. The distribution of the benefits is extremely uneven. The result is that people with the most desperate needs experience virtually no improvement in their living conditions. (Trainer 1997.)The growth strategy has the aim to maximize the rate of growth of business turnover i.e. to increase investment, sales, exports, and GNP, as fast as possible. The economic experts assume that the increased wealth this produces, the capitalists will re-invest in society; this will then further increase productivity, and will trickle-down and enrich even the poorest. In reality, very little wealth ever trickles down. The strategy does result in a rapid increase of national wealth, but those who are already rich get almost all of it. The reason that the wealth generated will flow into production of goods, which are attractive for the high-income earners and for export to the rich countries. Thus, the wrong industries will be set up in the South. Rather than producing simple tools, cheap housing, and clean water, all of which are helpful for poor people, capitalists invest their resources into export plantations or car factories. In addition, the rich people in the South often want to spend their money on Western lifestyles. They therefore import Western consumer goods, rather investing their wealth into social production. This will not give livelihoods to poor people. Their choice oppositely gives income to the North. Thus, paradoxically, development aid ends up benefitting the Southern elite and the rich countries in the North, which provided the initial aid, rather than the poor people in the country who received the aid. Consequently, the growth and trickle-down strategy is on a head-on collision course with anything that one can call an appropriate development strategy (Ekins 1992; Trainer 1997.)In this way, development creates a cycle that is exploitative of poor people in poor countries: First rich countries give aid to poor countries. Secondly, the aid benefits activities relating mainly to the middle-class and the elites. Thirdly, these people spend their profit on production of export goods or on imports from the rich countries. Fourthly, in the process the elite use the natural resources of subsistence living people. Fifthly, the traditional people loose their subsistence, and their governments do not compensate them; these people therefore become destitute and absolute poor. Paul Ekins (1992) calls it the “aid and development cycle.” Ted Trainer (1997)calls it “inappropriate development.”

**These developmental discourses manifest themselves in a form of violent imperialism and militarism, waging perpetual war through the power to let die**

**Duffield 7** (Mark Duffield, professor emeritus at the University of Bristol, former director of the Global Insecurities Centre, 2007, “Development, Security and Unending War,” pp 1-8) gz

Since the end of the Cold war, the claim that development requires security, and without security you cannot have development, has been repeated to the point or monotony in countless government reports, policy statements, UN documents, briefings by non-govern- mental organizations (NGOs), academic works and so on (DAC 1997; Solana 2003; DFID 2005b). Such has been the widespread acceptance of this circular complementarity that it now qualifies as an accepted truth of our time. Since coming into office in 1997, for example, Britain's New Labour government has consciously placed the mutual conditioning of development and security at the heart of its international development policy (DFID 1997). Reflecting and orchestrating the international policy consensus, numerous speeches and policy documents have argued that globalization, besides bringing great benefits and opportunities, has also brought into existence a shrinking and radically interconnected world in which distant and hence nationally unimportant problems no longer exist (for overview see Abrahamson 20o5). The ripple effects of poverty, environmental collapse, civil conflict or health crises require international management, since they do not respect geographical boundaries. Otherwise, they will inundate and destabilize Western society. While building on earlier precepts (OECD 1998; Collier 2000), the moral of al-Qaida in Afghanistan has not been lost on policy makers. That is, ignoring ineffective states and vulnerable peoples opens them to the risk of colonization by criminal interests and groups politically hostile to the democratic world (DAC 2003). Gordon Brown, Britain’s Chancellor of the Exchequer at the time of writing, sums up this worldview as follows. We understand that it is not just morally and ethically right that develop- ing countries move from poverty to prosperity, but that it is a political imperative - central to our long-term national security and peace - to tackle the poverty that leads to civil wars, failed states and safe havens for terrorists. (Quoted in Christian Aid 2004: 2) While it is accepted that poverty does not cause terrorism, it is argued that it fosters exclusion and alienation, which terrorist organiz ations can exploit to garner support, if not recruits. The consequent policy demand has been that development interventions should better focus on such risks and, especially, take failed and fragile states more seriously (DFID 2005a). This includes the search for new policy instruments to strengthen state capacity, provide order and, at the same time, deliver basic economic and welfare services to the peoples involved (Leader and Colenso 2005). This book, however, is not so much concerned with development as a series of techniques and interventions for improving or bettering others; it is more interested in examining the role and function of these technologies in securing the Western way of life. Foregrounding the liberal problematic of security As reflected in the above quote, guiding current thinking is the assumption that not only is it the moral duty of effective states to protect and better the lives of people living within ineffective ones, but such help also strengthens international security. This enlightened self-interest can also be seen, for example, in the remarks made by Tony Blair, the then UK Prime Minister, on the launch of the Africa Commission's development report in March 2005. British national interest, it is argued, is interconnected with events and conditions in other countries and continents. Famines and instability ‘thousands of miles away lead to conflict, despair, mass migration and fanaticism that can affect us all. So for reasons of self-interest as well as morality, we can no longer turn our back on Africa' (Blair 2005). That Africa is currently not high on the list of terrorism-exporting continents does not invalidate this position. Rather, it suggests that the moral logic linking development and security is an expansive and universalizing one. Because development reduces poverty and hence the risk of future instability, it also improves our own security. In justifying the post-Cold War phase of renewed Western interventionism, there are many examples of a claimed enlightened complementarity linking development and security (Solana 2003: Bush 2002). Indeed, such claims constitute the ethical canon of today's international activism (Douzinas 2003). The complementarity between development and security is usually described as signalling a post-Cold war widening of the meaning of security. From a concern with the security of states, international dangers associated with societal breakdown, unsustainable popula tion growth, environmental stress or endemic poverty are seen as widening the scope of security beyond its traditional focus on military threats. Often described as prioritizing the security of people rather than states, the broadening of security to embrace society informs current views on ‘human security' (UNDP 1994a). Since the risks to human security are largely associated with underdevelopment, broad ening the scope of security to include the protection and betterment of the world’s poor and marginalized peoples establishes its complementarity with development. This widening of security is usually seen by politicians, policy makers and academics as a new departure. At the same time, the complementarity between development and security is accepted as unproblematic, indeed, as marking a progressive turn (King and Murray 2001: CHS 2003; HSC 2005). If explained at all, it is presented as reflecting the humanistic advances that international society has made, compared with the restrictions of the Cold War (Mack 2002). According to this position, given a lack of political will regarding underdevelopment, calling for enlightened self-interest staked on the West's own future and security is an important way of mobilizing public interest and commitment. There are, however, many commentators that are uncomfortable with the increasing invocation of security as the primary means or improv. ing the human condition and strengthening international society. The ‘Copenhagen School’ of International Relations theory, for example, has drawn attention to the increasing recourse, especially since the end of the Cold War, by politicians, policy makers and security professionals to a process or strategy of 'securitization' (Waever et al. 1993; Buzan et al. 1997: Huysmans 2000). That is, there is a tendency for such groups to describe an ever widening range of social trends, conditions and prac tices through a lens of security. Security from this perspective is often less an objective condition and more the way in which professional groups compete for visibility, influence and scarce resources. An import ant question that securitization raises is not that of more or less secur rity, but whether many of the conditions so described should be treated as security issues at all. Securitization draws attention to the dangers and unforeseen political and normative consequences of a too ready willingness on the part of professionals and gatekeepers to invoke secu rity for reasons of institutional or group advantage. In relation to Africa, for example, it has been argued that the securitization of underdevelopm ent is both undesirable and an inadequate response to the situation (Abrahamson 20o5: 61. 7o). It not only fosters fear and unease, it tends to divide the continent from the rest of the world, favours policies or cont ainment and is encouraging the militarization of the continent. While such concerns are of great importance, central to this book is the argument that the relationship between development and security also has a long genealogy. Rather than being a new departure, its current prominence is connected with the return to the political foreg round of a liberal problematic of security (Agamben 2o05). This fore- grounding focuses attention on the existence of a liberal will to power that, in securitizing the present, is also able to vector across time and space, that is, bridge the past and present as well as connecting the national and international. Such an understanding is central to this book. While a liberal problematic of security is well represented in the contemporary idea of human security, since the beginnings of modernity, a liberal rationality of government has always been based on the protection and betterment of the essential processes of life associated with population, economy and society. A liberal problematic of security is concerned with people and all the multiform processes, conditions and contingencies that either promote or retard life and wellbeing. It is concerned with securing these biological and social processes in the name of people, rights and freedom. Although largely 'non-political’ in nature, being located within populations, communities and the economy, these processes are nevertheless the foundations of good gov ernment. Liberalism embodies the idea of ‘government of the popula tion and the imperatives that are derived from such an idea' (Dean 1999: 113). Securitization raises important concerns over the dangers of a too ready willingness by the state and professional groups to invoke the exceptionalism of security in relation to a widening range of life and society processes. This book poses an additional set of questions: why does a liberal problematic of security now dominate the political foreground and how does it operate within the architecture of post-Cold War humanitarian, development and peace interventionism? Linking biopolitics, liberalism and development In addressing these concerns, liberalism is considered as a technology of government involving a specific design or means of strategizing power. A defining characteristic of liberalism is that it takes people and their life and freedom as its essential reference point (Mehta 1999). In understanding liberalism as power, it is useful to introduce Foucault's conception of ’biopolitics' (Foucault (1975—6], [1976], [19781). while lib- eralism and biopolitics are not same, as Mitchell Dean argues, biopoli tics is 'a necessary condition of liberalism' (Dean 1999: 113). Biopolitics is a form of politics that entails the administration of the processes of life at the aggregate level of population. While the more familiar term ‘geopolitics’ interconnects and interrogates states, terri tories and alliances, territories come with populations, livelihood systems and life processes. Besides military readiness and the diplom macy of political alliance, since the nineteenth century effective states have also progressively expanded their knowledge and ability to support life and help populations realize their optimal productive and reproductive potential. The nature and implications of this biopolitical relationship between states, territories and population has been neglected by mainstream international relations and development studies alike (Jahn 2005; Biccum 2005). Yet, as will be argued below, since the beginning of the twentieth century, how groups, communi- ties and peoples are acted upon in order to support and promote coll lective life has shaped and deepened a biopolitical distinction between ‘developed’ and 'underdeveloped’ species-life — a distinction that is now integral to racial discourse, global insurgency and unending war. Biopolitics marks the passage from the classical age to the modern one. Compared with the ancient right of the sovereign to take life or let live, biopolitics marks a new power: 'to foster life or disallow it to the point of death’ (Foucault [1976]: 138). Beginning in the seven- teenth century, this new power over life evolved in two basic forms. The first was a disciplinary and individualizing power, focusing on the *human-as-machine* and associated with the emergence of the great institutions such as medicine, education, punishment or the military (see Foucault [1975]). From the middle of the eighteenth century, however, a complementary but different power over life emerges. This newer form does not discipline the human-as-machine, it is an aggre- gatting or massifying power concerned with regulating the human-as- species. It is a regulatory power that operates at the collective level of population (Foucault [1975-6]: 243). This regulatory biopolitics func tions differently from the more localized, individualizing and institu- tionally based disciplinary power. Achieving massified outcomes also requires more complex systems of coordination and centralization associated with the state. Regulatory biopolitics emerged out of the statistical, demographic. economic and epidemiological knowledge through which life was being discovered in its modern societal form, that is, as a series of interconnected natural, social and economic processes operating in and through population. The multiple factors that are aggregated within a population appear at the level of the individual as chance, unpredictable and contingent events. Rather than acting on the indi- vidual per se, a regulatory biopolitics seeks to intervene at the level of the collective, where apparently random events reveal themselves as population trends, social variables and probabilities. The discovery of the dynamics of population 'established the paradoxical position of life both as an autonomous domain and as an object and objective of systems of administration' (Dean 1999: 99). Biopolitics attempts to rationalize the problem of governing groups of humans represented in the form of population. Such problems are manifest in a variety of locations, including the family, health, housing, education and longevity: they connect with rates of economic growth, working con- ditions, standards of living, nutrition and the environment: they also relate to race, ethnicity, migration and social cohesion: today, probl ems of population even appear at the level of the genetic make-up of life itself. Biopolitics acts in the interests of collective or aggregate life through knowledge of the ‘processes that sustain or retard the opti mization of the life of a population' (ibid.: 99). Liberalism is a technology of government that supports freedom while governing people through the interconnected natural, social and economic processes that together sustain life. Foucault used the emerg ence of biopolitics as the terrain on which to situate the classical liberal problematic of how much to govern. Too much government - in the form of state planning, for example - and the dynamism and crea tive potential of the life processes on which freedom depends are destroyed. Governing too little, however, risks failing 'to establish the conditions of civility, order, productivity and national well-being which make limited government possible’ (Rose 2000: 70). Since liberalism is not the same as biopolitics it can, importantly, be critical of the exces sive disciplining and regulation of population. At the same time, however, it is dependent on such interventions being effective as a cond ition of order and liberal government. From this perspective, liberali sm is not an historical period, the product of specific groups or a substantive doctrine: it is an ethos or government that attempts to govern life through its freedom. At the same time, however, it is cons scious of the disorder that excess freedom can bring. As a design of power, there is no essential relationship between liberalism, the rule of law or representative democracy. A democracy is not necessarily liberal, nor is liberalism of itself democratic: liberalism simply embodies a timeless 'search for a liberal technology of government' (Foucault quoted by Dean 1999: 120). As a technology or governing life through its freedom, the absence of an essential relationship between liberalism and democracy helps to explain the enduring paradox of liberalism. During the nineteenth century, liberalism typically supported the rule of law and democratic reform at home. At the same time, however, it also accepted the neces sity of non-representative and despotic forms of imperial rule overseas (Jahn 2005; Pitts 2003). The idea of 'development' is one way of resolv ing this apparent paradox. Just as biopolitics and liberalism are not the same, development is likewise different. As with liberalism, however, biopolitics is also a necessary condition of development: biopolitics, liberalism and development are different but intimately intercon nected. If biopolitics uncovers the dynamics of life at the level of pop ulation, and liberalism seeks to govern life through its freedom, then development provides a solution to the problem of governing too much or too little. Since the end of the eighteenth century develop ment has embodied a recurrent deference to the theory and practice of an enlightened, gradualist and educative trusteeship over life (Cowen and Shenton 1996: 27: Mehta 1999: 191-216). The import ance of moral trusteeship to liberalism as an art or government explains its frequent criticism of imperial violence and excess. However, it was also able to accept colonial nule when the responsi bility of trusteeship was deemed to be humanely and hence effectively discharged (Morel 1920). A developmental trusteeship is a liberal framework of government that allows the powers of freedom to be learned and safely applied. Once thought to be no longer applicable in a decolonized world, a liberal conception of trusteeship has once again entered the political foreground following the renewed wave of western humanitarian and peace interventionism in the post-Cold War period. There has been a revival of interest in liberal imperialism — indeed, an attempt to rehabilitate its self-proclaimed role of protecting and bettering the world (Ferguson 2003; Cooper 2002; Coker 2003). With the exception of Iraq, where mismanagement and horrendous violence have damaged hopes of effective trusteeship, liberal opinion has widely supported the West's renewed interventionism (Furedi 1994). Michael Ignatieff’s (2003) book *Empire Lite*, for example, captures today's acceptance of the necessity of a period of illiberal rule abroad. Awakened by the threat of world disorder and led by avowed anti- imperialists, today's interventionism constitutes a new form 'of osten sibly humanitarian empire in which Western powers led by the United States band together to rebuild state order and reconstruct war-torn societies for the sake of global stability and security’ (ibid.: 19). This new empire is being implemented by novel institutional arrangements and divisions of labour linking donor governments, UN agencies, militaries and NGOs. It promises self-rule, not in some distant future but quickly and within an agreed framework. In dealing with elites, many of whom are the products of modern nationalism. the intention is that they should be empowered to succeed. Today's Empire Lite is only legitimate if it results in the betterment of people and their early self-management. It is imperialism ‘in a hurry, to spend money, to get results, to turn the place back to locals and get out' (ibid.). For Ignatieff. if there is a problem with this new interven tionism, it is that it does not practise the partnership and empower- ment that it preaches and is dogged by short-termism and promises betrayed. There is also another and broader conception of trusteeship. Although connected, it lacks the spectacle and immediacy of Ignatieff’s territorial ‘laboratories' of post-interventionary society (ibid.: 20). Since it is more pervasive and subtle, however, it is arguably more significant. While also having a liberal genealogy, it is about securing freedom by supporting households and community organiz ations, based on the small-scale ownership of land or property, in their search for economic autonomy and the possibilities for political existence that this affords. It is a trusteeship that encourages local level self-reliance and self-realization ‘both through and against the state' (Cowen and Shenton 1996: 5). Such a trusteeship operates today in the ideas and institutions of sustainable development. It can be seen in the moral, educative and financial tutelage that aid agencies exert over the attitudes and behaviour of those subject to such development (Pupavac 2005). Although a relation of governance, it nonetheless speaks in terms of empowerment and partnership (Cooke and Kothari 2001). While western politicians currently argue that enlightened self-interest interconnects development and security, for those insecure humans living within ineffective states the reality of this virtuous circle is, once again, an educative trusteeship that aims to change behaviour and social organization according to a curriculum decided elsewhere.

**The impossibility of the gift necessitates a violent conception of debt that reinforces the economy logic of calculability – turns the case**

**Trussel 09** (Taylor Trussel – PhD candidate in Philosophy at Villanova University, January 2009, “The Gift of Power: Foucault, Derrida, and Normalization”, http://gradworks.umi.com/3352258.pdf) //MD

Here, then, for Derrida, is the fundamental paradox of the gift: to truly give a gift, ¶ there must be no debt or obligation or return whatsoever; but any gift—no matter how ¶ much we genuinely wish to give freely—obligates the other to give in return. ¶ For there to be a gift, there must be no reciprocity, return, exchange, ¶ countergift, or debt. If the other gives me back or owes me or has to give ¶ me back what I gave him or her, there will not have been a gift, whether ¶ this restitution is immediate or whether it is programmed by a complex ¶ calculation of long-term deferral or differance (GT, 12). ¶ ¶ Reciprocity produces an economic relationship, which nullifies the original gift. The gift ¶ can have nothing to do with exchange, but the gift—counter-gift dynamic is precisely ¶ that. In the end, my gift to you costs me nothing because I get something of equal value ¶ in return. When I give my gift, I essentially buy your gratitude or your counter-gift or ¶ your indebtedness. I have given nothing. The image of two people giving each other the ¶ same DVD for Christmas illustrates just how exchange nullifies the gift: nothing has been ¶ given because nothing has been lost; parity is restored instantly. The relationships Mauss ¶ examines are, therefore, not gift relationships. Instead, they are essentially exchanges of ¶ goods, and any such exchange creates an economy. As Derrida shows, **an economy is the antithesis of a gift.** “Economy,” oikonomia, ¶ consists of two elements: the oikos, the hearth or the home; and nomos, the law, “the law of distribution (nemein), the law of sharing or partition, the law as partition (moira), the ¶ given or assigned part, participation” (GT, 6). As the law of the hearth, economy relates ¶ to management of scarce resources. Economic thinking aims to ensure that nothing is ¶ wasted and that expenses equal income. Any economy is directed with an eye toward a ¶ return on investment that is at last equal to the resources that have been expended, if not ¶ more. Within this restricted economic framework is the broader logic of lack and ¶ demand: resources are limited and must therefore be utilized in an efficient and effective ¶ manner; **utility must be maximized.** The figure of the economy is the circle: resources go ¶ out and resources come in. **It is the nature of an economy to seek closure.** Sooner or ¶ later, the books must balance, and all debits and credits must equal zero. The circle must ¶ be complete; the system must find equilibrium. Such is the operative logic of quid pro ¶ quo. We pay out with one hand while receiving with the other, which is precisely what is ¶ wrong with the image of giving proffered by Mauss: whether it is gifts exchanged around ¶ the Christmas tree or the movement of goods through the Kula Ring, giving as Mauss ¶ perceives it always requires giving back.

## 2NC

### Framework

situated position underpins political efficacy

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.

Moreover, 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.

4) The aff’s identification with the state destroys agency and the value to life—reforming the state without first changing our relationship with it triggers all their harms

**Schaffer 7** (Butler, Prof @ Southwestern U School of Law, Identifying with the State, LewRockwell.com, http://archive.lewrockwell.com/shaffer/shaffer159.html)//LA \*\*\*We don’t endorse ableist language.

One of the deadliest practices we engage in is that of identifying ourselves with a collective entity. Whether it be the state, a nationality, our race or gender, or any other abstraction, we introduce division — hence, conflict — into our lives as we separate ourselves from those who identify with other groupings. If one observes the state of our world today, this is the pattern that underlies our deadly and destructive social behavior. This mindset was no better articulated than when George W. Bush declared “you're either with us, or against us.” Through years of careful conditioning, we learn to think of ourselves in terms of agencies and/or abstractions external to our independent being. Or, to express the point more clearly, we have learned to internalize these external forces; to conform our thinking and behavior to the purposes and interests of such entities. We adorn ourselves with flags, mouth shibboleths, and decorate our cars with bumper-stickers, in order to communicate to others our sense of “who we are.” In such ways does our being become indistinguishable from our chosen collective. In this way are institutions born. We discover a particular form of organization through which we are able to cooperate with others for our mutual benefit. Over time, the advantages derived from this system have a sufficient consistency to lead us to the conclusion that our well-being is dependent upon it. Those who manage the organization find it in their self-interests to propagate this belief so that we will become dependent upon its permanency. Like a sculptor working with clay, institutions take over the direction of our minds, twisting, squeezing, and pounding upon them until we have embraced a mindset conducive to their interests. Once this has been accomplished, we find it easy to subvert our will and sense of purpose to the collective. The organization ceases being a mere tool of mutual convenience, and becomes an end in itself. Our lives become “institutionalized,” and we regard it as fanciful to imagine ourselves living in any other way than as constituent parts of a machine that transcends our individual sense. Once we identify ourselves with the state, that collective entity does more than represent who we are; it is who we are. To the politicized mind, the idea that “we are the government” has real meaning, not in the sense of being able to control such an agency, but in the psychological sense. The successes and failures of the state become the subject's successes and failures; insults or other attacks upon their abstract sense of being — such as the burning of “their” flag — become assaults upon their very personhood. Shortcomings on the part of the state become our failures of character. This is why so many Americans who have belatedly come to criticize the war against Iraq are inclined to treat it as only a “mistake” or the product of “mismanagement,” not as a moral wrong. Our egos can more easily admit to the making of a mistake than to moral transgressions. Such an attitude also helps to explain why, as Milton Mayer wrote in his revealing post-World War II book, They Thought They Were Free, most Germans were unable to admit that the Nazi regime had been tyrannical. It is this dynamic that makes it easy for political officials to generate wars, a process that reinforces the sense of identity and attachment people have for “their” state. It also helps to explain why most Americans — though tiring of the war against Iraq — refuse to condemn government leaders for the lies, forgeries, and deceit employed to get the war started: to acknowledge the dishonesty of the system through which they identify themselves is to admit to the dishonest base of their being. The truthfulness of the state's rationale for war is irrelevant to most of its subjects. It is sufficient that they believe the abstraction with which their lives are intertwined will be benefited in some way by war. Against whom and upon what claim does not matter — except as a factor in assessing the likelihood of success. That most Americans have pipped nary a squeak of protest over Bush administration plans to attack Iran — with nuclear weapons if deemed useful to its ends — reflects the point I am making. Bush could undertake a full-fledged war against Lapland, and most Americans would trot out their flags and bumper-stickers of approval. The “rightness” or “wrongness” of any form of collective behavior becomes interpreted by the standard of whose actions are being considered. During World War II, for example, Japanese kamikaze pilots were regarded as crazed fanatics for crashing their planes into American battleships. At the same time, American war movies (see, e.g., Flying Tigers) extolled the heroism of American pilots who did the same thing. One sees this same double-standard in responding to “conspiracy theories.” “Do you think a conspiracy was behind the 9/11 attacks?” It certainly seems so to me, unless one is prepared to treat the disappearance of the World Trade Center buildings as the consequence of a couple pilots having bad navigational experiences! The question that should be asked is: whose conspiracy was it? To those whose identities coincide with the state, such a question is easily answered: others conspire, we do not. It is not the symbiotic relationship between war and the expansion of state power, nor the realization of corporate benefits that could not be obtained in a free market, that mobilize the machinery of war. Without most of us standing behind “our” system, and cheering on “our” troops, and defending “our” leaders, none of this would be possible. What would be your likely response if your neighbor prevailed upon you to join him in a violent attack upon a local convenience store, on the grounds that it hired “illegal aliens?” Your sense of identity would not be implicated in his efforts, and you would likely dismiss him as a lunatic. Only when our ego-identities become wrapped up with some institutional abstraction — such as the state — can we be persuaded to invest our lives and the lives of our children in the collective madness of state action. We do not have such attitudes toward organizations with which we have more transitory relationships. If we find an accounting error in our bank statement, we would not find satisfaction in the proposition “the First National Bank, right or wrong.” Neither would we be inclined to wear a T-shirt that read “Disneyland: love it or leave it.” One of the many adverse consequences of identifying with and attaching ourselves to collective abstractions is our loss of control over not only the meaning and direction in our lives, but of the manner in which we can be efficacious in our efforts to pursue the purposes that have become central to us. We become dependent upon the performance of “our” group; “our” reputation rises or falls on the basis of what institutional leaders do or fail to do. If “our” nation-state loses respect in the world — such as by the use of torture or killing innocent people - we consider ourselves no longer respectable, and scurry to find plausible excuses to redeem our egos. When these expectations are not met, we go in search of new leaders or organizational reforms we believe will restore our sense of purpose and pride that we have allowed abstract entities to personify for us. As the costs and failures of the state become increasingly evident, there is a growing tendency to blame this system. But to do so is to continue playing the same game into which we have allowed ourselves to become conditioned. One of the practices employed by the state to get us to mobilize our “dark side” energies in opposition to the endless recycling of enemies it has chosen for us, is that of psychological projection. Whether we care to acknowledge it or not — and most of us do not — each of us has an unconscious capacity for attitudes or conduct that our conscious minds reject. We fear that, sufficiently provoked, we might engage in violence — even deadly — against others; or that inducements might cause us to become dishonest. We might harbor racist or other bigoted sentiments, or consider ourselves lazy or irresponsible. Though we are unlikely to act upon such inner fears, their presence within us can generate discomforting self-directed feelings of guilt, anger, or unworthiness that we would like to eliminate. The most common way in which humanity has tried to bring about such an exorcism is by subconsciously projecting these traits onto others (i.e., “scapegoats”) and punishing them for what are really our own shortcomings. The state has trained us to behave this way, in order that we may be counted upon to invest our lives, resources, and other energies in pursuit of the enemy du jour. It is somewhat ironic, therefore, that most of us resort to the same practice in our criticism of political systems. After years of mouthing the high-school civics class mantra about the necessity for government — and the bigger the government the better — we begin to experience the unexpected consequences of politicization. Tax burdens continue to escalate; or the state takes our home to make way for a proposed shopping center; or ever-more details of our lives are micromanaged by ever-burgeoning state bureaucracies. Having grown weary of the costs — including the loss of control over our lives — we blame the state for what has befallen us. We condemn the Bush administration for the parade of lies that precipitated the war against Iraq, rather than indicting ourselves for ever believing anything the state tells us. We fault the politicians for the skyrocketing costs of governmental programs, conveniently ignoring our insistence upon this or that benefit whose costs we would prefer having others pay. The statists have helped us accept a world view that conflates our incompetence to manage our own lives with their omniscience to manage the lives of billions of people — along with the planet upon which we live! — and we are now experiencing the costs generated by our own gullibility. We have acted like country bumpkins at the state fair with the egg money who, having been fleeced by a bunch of carnival sharpies, look everywhere for someone to blame other than ourselves. We have been euchred out of our very lives because of our eagerness to believe that benefits can be enjoyed without incurring costs; that the freedom to control one's life can be separated from the responsibilities for one's actions; and that two plus two does not have to add up to four if a sizeable public opinion can be amassed against the proposition. By identifying ourselves with any abstraction (such as the state) we give up the integrated life, the sense of wholeness that can be found only within each of us. While the state has manipulated, cajoled, and threatened us to identify ourselves with it, the responsibility for our acceding to its pressures lies within each of us. The statists have — as was their vicious purpose — simply taken over the territory we have abandoned. Our politico-centric pain and suffering has been brought about by our having allowed external forces to move in and occupy the vacuum we created at the center of our being. The only way out of our dilemma involves a retracing of the route that brought us to where we are. We require nothing so much right now as the development of a sense of “who we are” that transcends our institutionalized identities, and returns us – without division and conflict – to a centered, self-directed integrity in our lives.

### Util

Utilitarian problem solving 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

### AT: perm

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.

**The affirmative’s discourse of Iran is not only patently false but plays into a larger structure of militarism dominating the modern public sphere – this economy of violence actualizes their apocalyptic rhetoric and perpetuates endless genocide**

**Cunningham 13** (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, 4-23-13, “Hagel on Middle East Tour; US Steps Up Regime Change Bid on Iran,” <http://nsnbc.me/2013/04/23/hagel%C2%B4s-middle-east-tour-us-steps-up-regime-change-bid-on-iran/>) gz

Hagel’s cozying up to Israeli partners-in-crime nails the lie that the Obama White House is somehow at odds with Tel Aviv over Middle East policy and Iran in particular. Nothing could be further from the truth. Washington is as wired for war as ever, and this belligerent impetus comes from Washington, not the rogue entity in Tel Aviv. In what can only be described as a grotesque display of lawlessness and incendiary rhetoric, Hagel declared Iran a “real threat” and said that the US would stand by the Israeli state if the latter chose to launch a preemptive military strike on the Islamic Republic. “The bottom line is that Iran is a threat, a real threat,” Hagel told reporters while onboard his weekend flight to the Middle East. Hagel flew into Tel Aviv bearing gifts worth $10 billion in the latest American military hardware, including upgraded precision-guided missiles, stealth radar equipment, V22 Osprey transport warplanes and the giant 135-KC refueling aerial tankers. The arms deal “sends a clear message to Iran” that the military option is on the table, warned Hagel. The items in the weapons inventory convey a thinly veiled threat of attack on Iran. The Israeli state, which has a wanton criminal track record for unilateral air strikes against neighbouring countries over many decades, will now be in a stronger position to conduct bombing raids on geographically more remote Iran, as a result of the latest longer-range capabilities bestowed by its US patron. And it’s not just the Tel Aviv regime that the US is arming to the teeth. The Sunni dictatorships of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates – sworn enemies of Shia Iran in their proxy war-making in Syria and Iraq – are also to enjoy the latest military munificence from Washington. Reports say that the $10bn arms supply is to include air-to-ground missiles for Saudi Arabia and F-16 fighter jets for the UAE. What this amounts to is an escalation of all-out war threat towards Iran from Washington and its regional client regimes. This display of unprovoked militarism

by the US towards Iran constitutes an act of aggression, which is in itself a war crime. Iran’s government should consider filing a lawsuit. The crime is all the more damning because it has no rational or material foundation. It is a gratuitous threat of violence against a sovereign, peaceful country based on paranoid misinformation and downright calumny. Of course, nothing should surprise us about US or Israeli criminality and state terrorism given the recent genocides in Afghanistan and Iraq, and crimes against humanity in Lebanon and Libya and ongoing in Palestine, Syria, Pakistan and Somalia, among other places. While pathetically fawning over his Israeli hosts, Hagel reiterated the hackneyed lies about Iran’s nuclear program. “The Iranians must be prevented from developing that capacity to build a nuclear weapon and deliver it,” said Hagel. This is disgraceful, asinine deception hardly worth repeating. But for the record, the US secretary of offence went on to say: “Iran presents a threat in its nuclear program and Israel will make its decisions that Israel must make to protect itself and defend itself.” What is disturbing about this trope is that one of America’s senior military chiefs – who takes decisions on whether to go to war or not – is either telling barefaced lies or is woefully ignorant of hiscountry’s own intelligence estimates. Only last week in Washington, the US Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, told a Senate Committee that Iran does not have a nuclear weapon. This is a well-established assessment of Iran’s nuclear program, which has been made previously by over a dozen US intelligence organizations, going back several years. Clapper also told the Senate Intelligence Committee that he did not know whether Iran’s leadership would in the future decide to build a nuclear weapon, but the fact is that the country did not have a nuclear weapons program now, nor was Iran pursuing an aggressive regional policy. To that assessment, we can add the clear, unambiguous statements by Iranian leaders that the country has no intention to pursue the construction of nuclear arms out of deeply held ethical reasons and also out of many practical considerations. Only last week Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad while on an official visit to Africa denounced the age of nuclear weapons as a relic of the past. However, he added that Iran has every right to develop nuclear energy, as for all nations. So, if US militarism towards Iran is not justified or credible based on the false claims of nuclear threat, what is it really about? It harks back to the old chestnut, regime change. Many people know this already perhaps, but what seems necessary is to expose this agenda, and the American criminality behind it, beyond any doubt to the wider world and the Western public in particular. Recent remarks from John Kerry, the US secretary of state, about tightening (illegal) economic sanctions on Iran and the possible influence the US intends that this will have on the outcome of the Iranian presidential elections in June has to be seen in the context of a multi-pronged offensive tactic. The American-backed proxy genocidal war on Iran’s main regional ally Syria is also part of this game plan. The latest stepped-up threats of criminal war on Iran – under the spurious pretext of nuclear weapons and “Israeli security” – are evidently part of the wider effort by Washington to pile pressure on the Iranian people and their government. Criminal, heinous, and most likely futile, but nevertheless Washington feels that it can force Iran to buckle under the weight of political, economic and military war.

### AT: 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

### SCS

#### No Chinese aggression in the SCS

Fravel 12—Associate Professor of Political Science and member of the Security Studies Program at MIT. (Taylor, All Quiet in the South China Sea, 3/22/12, www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137346/m-taylor-fravel/all-quiet-in-the-south-china-sea?page=show)

Little noticed, however, has been China's recent adoption of a new -- and much more moderate -- approach. The primary goals of the friendlier policy are to restore China's tarnished image in East Asia and to reduce the rationale for a more active U.S. role there. ¶ The first sign of China's new approach came last June, when Hanoi dispatched a special envoy to Beijing for talks about the countries' various maritime disputes. The visit paved the way for an agreement in July 2011 between China and the ten members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) to finally implement a declaration of a code of conduct they had originally drafted in 2002 after a series of incidents in the South China Sea. In that declaration, they agreed to "exercise self-restraint in the conduct of activities that would complicate or escalate disputes."¶ Since the summer, senior Chinese officials, especially top political leaders such as President Hu Jintao and Premier Wen Jiabao, have repeatedly reaffirmed the late Deng Xiaoping's guidelines for dealing with China's maritime conflicts to focus on economic cooperation while delaying the final resolution of the underlying claims. In August 2011, for example, Hu echoed Deng's approach by stating that "the countries concerned may put aside the disputes and actively explore forms of common development in the relevant sea areas."¶ Authoritative Chinese-language media, too, has begun to underscore the importance of cooperation. Since August, the international department of People's Daily (under the pen name Zhong Sheng) has published several columns stressing the need to be less confrontational in the South China Sea. In January 2012, for example, Zhong Sheng discussed the importance of "pragmatic cooperation" to achieve "concrete results." Since the People's Daily is the official paper of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, such articles should be interpreted as the party's attempts to explain its new policy to domestic readers, especially those working lower down in party and state bureaucracies.¶ In terms of actually setting aside disputes, China has made progress. In addition to the July consensus with ASEAN, in October China reached an agreement with Vietnam on "basic principles guiding the settlement of maritime issues." The accord stressed following international law, especially the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. Since then, China and Vietnam have begun to implement the agreement by establishing a working group to demarcate and develop the southern portion of the Gulf of Tonkin near the disputed Paracel Islands.¶ China has also initiated or participated in several working-level meetings to address regional concerns about Beijing's assertiveness. Just before the East Asian Summit last November, China announced that it would establish a three billion yuan ($476 million) fund for China-ASEAN maritime cooperation on scientific research, environmental protection, freedom of navigation, search and rescue, and combating transnational crimes at sea. The following month, China convened several workshops on oceanography and freedom of navigation in the South China Sea, and in January it hosted a meeting with senior ASEAN officials to discuss implementing the 2002 code of conduct declaration. The breadth of proposed cooperative activities indicates that China's new approach is probably more than just a mere stalling tactic.¶ Beyond China's new efforts to demonstrate that it is ready to pursue a more cooperative approach, the country has also halted many of the more assertive behaviors that had attracted attention between 2009 and 2011. For example, patrol ships from the Bureau of Fisheries Administration have rarely detained and held any Vietnamese fishermen since 2010. (Between 2005 and 2010, China detained 63 fishing boats and their crews, many of which were not released until a hefty fine was paid.) And Vietnamese and Philippine vessels have been able to conduct hydrocarbon exploration without interference from China. (Just last May, Chinese patrol ships cut the towed sonar cable of a Vietnamese ship to prevent it from completing a seismic survey.) More generally, China has not obstructed any recent exploration-related activities, such as Exxon's drilling in October of an exploratory well in waters claimed by both Vietnam and China. Given that China retains the capability to interfere with such activities, its failure to do so suggests a conscious choice to be a friendlier neighbor. ¶ The question, of course, is why did the Chinese shift to a more moderate approach? More than anything, Beijing has come to realize that its assertiveness was harming its broader foreign policy interests. One principle of China's current grand strategy is to maintain good ties with great powers, its immediate neighbors, and the developing world. Through its actions in the South China Sea, China had undermined this principle and tarnished the cordial image in Southeast Asia that it had worked to cultivate in the preceding decade. It had created a shared interest among countries there in countering China -- and an incentive for them to seek support from Washington. In so doing, China's actions provided a strong rationale for greater U.S. involvement in the region and inserted the South China Sea disputes into the U.S.-Chinese relationship.¶ By last summer, China had simply recognized that it had overreached. Now, Beijing wants to project a more benign image in the region to prevent the formation of a group of Asian states allied against China, reduce Southeast Asian states' desire to further improve ties with the United States, and weaken the rationale for a greater U.S. role in these disputes and in the region.¶ So far, Beijing's new approach seems to be working, especially with Vietnam. China and Vietnam have deepened their political relationship through frequent high-level exchanges. Visits by the Vietnamese Communist Party general secretary, Nguyen Phu Trong, to Beijing in October 2011 and by the Chinese heir apparent, Xi Jinping, to Hanoi in December 2011 were designed to soothe spirits and protect the broader bilateral relationship from the unresolved disputes over territory in the South China Sea. In October, the two also agreed to a five-year plan to increase their bilateral trade to $60 billion by 2015. And just last month, foreign ministers from both countries agreed to set up working groups on functional issues such as maritime search and rescue and establish a hotline between the two foreign ministries, in addition to starting talks over the demarcation of the Gulf of Tonkin.

don’t evaluate apocalypse – replace your view of *war as event* with *war as presence* – otherwise the militarization of society will consume the planet

cuomo 96 – PhD, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Department of Philosophy, University of Cincinnati (Chris, Hypatia Fall 1996. Vol. 11, Issue 3, pg 30)

In "Gender and `Postmodern' War," Robin Schott introduces some of the ways in which war is currently best seen not as an event but as a presence (Schott 1995). Schott argues that postmodern understandings of persons, states, and politics, as well as the high-tech nature of much contemporary warfare and the preponderance of civil and nationalist wars, render an eventbased conception of war inadequate, especially insofar as gender is taken into account. In this essay, I will expand upon her argument by showing that accounts of war that only focus on events are impoverished in a number of ways, and therefore feminist consideration of the political, ethical, and ontological dimensions of war and the possibilities for resistance demand a much more complicated approach. I take Schott's characterization of war as presence as a point of departure, though I am not committed to the idea that the constancy of militarism, the fact of its omnipresence in human experience, and the paucity of an event-based account of war are exclusive to contemporary postmodern or postcolonial circumstances.(1) Theory that does not investigate or even notice the omnipresence of militarism cannot represent or address the depth and specificity of the everyday effects of militarism on women, on people living in occupied territories, on members of military institutions, and on the environment. These effects are relevant to feminists in a number of ways because military practices and institutions help construct gendered and national identity, and because they justify the destruction of natural nonhuman entities and communities during peacetime. Lack of attention to these aspects of the business of making or preventing military violence in an extremely technologized world results in theory that cannot accommodate the connections among the constant presence of militarism, declared wars, and other closely related social phenomena, such as nationalistic glorifications of motherhood, media violence, and current ideological gravitations to military solutions for social problems. Ethical approaches that do not attend to the ways in which warfare and military practices are woven into the very fabric of life in twenty-first century technological states lead to crisis-based politics and analyses. For any feminism that aims to resist oppression and create alternative social and political options, crisis-based ethics and politics are problematic because they distract attention from the need for sustained resistance to the enmeshed, omnipresent systems of domination and oppression that so often function as givens in most people's lives. Neglecting the omnipresence of militarism allows the false belief that the absence of declared armed conflicts is peace, the polar opposite of war. It is particularly easy for those whose lives are shaped by the safety of privilege, and who do not regularly encounter the realities of militarism, to maintain this false belief. The belief that militarism is an ethical, political concern only regarding armed conflict, creates forms of resistance to militarism that are merely exercises in crisis control. Antiwar resistance is then mobilized when the "real" violence finally occurs, or when the stability of privilege is directly threatened, and at that point it is difficult not to respond in ways that make resisters drop all other political priorities. Crisis-driven attention to declarations of war might actually keep resisters complacent about and complicitous in the general presence of global militarism. Seeing war as necessarily embedded in constant military presence draws attention to the fact that horrific, state-sponsored violence is happening nearly all over, all of the time, and that it is perpetrated by military institutions and other militaristic agents of the state. Moving away from crisis-driven politics and ontologies concerning war and military violence also enables consideration of relationships among seemingly disparate phenomena, and therefore can shape more nuanced theoretical and practical forms of resistance. For example, investigating the ways in which war is part of a presence allows consideration of the relationships among the events of war and the following: how militarism is a foundational trope in the social and political imagination; how the pervasive presence and symbolism of soldiers/warriors/patriots shape meanings of gender; the ways in which threats of state-sponsored violence are a sometimes invisible/sometimes bold agent of racism, nationalism, and corporate interests; the fact that vast numbers of communities, cities, and nations are currently in the midst of excruciatingly violent circumstances. It also provides a lens for considering the relationships among the various kinds of violence that get labeled "war." Given current American obsessions with nationalism, guns, and militias, and growing hunger for the death penalty, prisons, and a more powerful police state, one cannot underestimate the need for philosophical and political attention to connections among phenomena like the "war on drugs," the "war on crime," and other state-funded militaristic campaigns. I propose that the constancy of militarism and its effects on social reality be reintroduced as a crucial locus of contemporary feminist attentions, and that feminists emphasize how wars are eruptions and manifestations of omnipresent militarism that is a product and tool of multiply oppressive, corporate, technocratic states.(2) Feminists should be particularly interested in making this shift because it better allows consideration of the effects of war and militarism on women, subjugated peoples, and environments. While giving attention to the constancy of militarism in contemporary life we need not neglect the importance of addressing the specific qualities of direct, large-scale, declared military conflicts. But the dramatic nature of declared, large-scale conflicts should not obfuscate the ways in which military violence pervades most societies in increasingly technologically sophisticated ways and the significance of military institutions and everyday practices in shaping reality. Philosophical discussions that focus only on the ethics of declaring and fighting wars miss these connections, and also miss the ways in which even declared military conflicts are often experienced as omnipresent horrors. These approaches also leave unquestioned tendencies to suspend or distort moral judgement in the face of what appears to be the inevitability of war and militarism.

## Reform

### Neolib/Development

Development link---

“**energy access alleviates poverty through** improved productivity, **greater** incomegenerating **opportunities, and micro-enterprise development”**

Lack of regulations set forth by the Mexican government means that the aff causes more harm than it alleviates – five internal links

AIDA 12 (The Interamerican Association for Environmental Defense, 12/17/12, “The challenges of deploying wind energy in Mexico. The case of the Isthmus of Tehuantepec”, <http://www.aida-americas.org/en/pubs/challenges-deploying-wind-energy-mexico-case-isthmus-tehuantepec> | JJ)

The Mexican government has authorized the development of at least 14 wind power projects on the Isthmus of Tehuantepec in Oaxaca, one of the poorest states in the country with a more than 34% indigenous population. The projects are backed by international investors including the Inter-American Development Bank and benefiting from the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) of the Kyoto Protocol. Even so, a number of projects have caused negative social and environmental impacts that outweigh the benefits, threatening the human rights of local indigenous communities, including the right to free, prior, and informed consent for projects affecting their lands and livelihoods. The reason for this problem is that the Mexican government has not developed effective rules or mechanisms to regulate these investments. Without them, private companies have had to negotiate directly with local communities. There are other factors aggravating the situation, too: Locals lack information: Residents of the Isthmus of Tehuantepec say they have not received comprehensive and timely information about the projects. Some residents said in recent public forums that they were not told about the potential environmental impacts of the projects, such as those now affecting the possibility to cultivate their lands. Threats and violence against locals opposing the projects: For more than two years, the Jijot and Zapoteca communities have raised complaints about their leaders receiving threats and attacks by paramilitary groups and state officials seeking to silence any opposition to the development of wind farms. Lack of free, prior and informed consent: In the rush to grant permits and administrative permissions to wind power developers, the Mexican government has not fulfilled its obligation to consult local indigenous communities as guaranteed by international law. Unreasonable terms of land leases: A number of wind developers have signed contracts with local communities that offer paltry payments for the use of their land. Locals have complained about the lack of a process for negotiating on fair and equal terms. Absence of comprehensive and community-wide benefits: Some wind projects lack a comprehensive environmental and social development plan, meaning that they only benefit a fraction of the population: mostly investors and the companies that will buy the energy. While some locals have leased their lands at reasonable prices, the payments haven’t brought the promised development.

### Gift

Reformism bad

**Arrigo and Williams 2000** (\*BRUCE A. ARRIGO – Professor of Criminology, Law, and Society at UNC Charlotte, and \*\*CHRISTOPHER R. WILLIAMS – Professor of Criminology at UWG, August 1, 2000, “The (Im) Possibility of Democratic Justice and the ''Gift'' of the Majority: On Derrida, Deconstruction, and the Search for Equality”, http://ccj.sagepub.com/content/16/3/321) //MD

The impediments to establishing democratic justice in contemporary American society have caused a national paralysis; one that has recklessly spawned an aporetic1 existence for minorities2. The entrenched ideological complexities afflicting under- and nonrepresented groups (e.g., poverty, unemployment, illiteracy, crime) at the hands of political, legal, cultural, and economic power elites have produced counterfeit, perhaps even fraudulent, efforts at reform: Discrimination and inequality in opportunity prevail (e.g., Lynch & Patterson, 1996). The misguided and futile initiatives of the state, in pursuit of transcending this public affairs crisis, have fostered a reification, that is, a reinforcement of divisiveness. This time, however, minority groups compete with one another for recognition, affirmation, and identity in the national collective psyche (Rosenfeld, 1993). What ensues by way of state effort, though, is a contemporaneous sense of equality for all and a near imperceptible endorsement of inequality; a silent conviction that the majority3 still retains power.4 ¶ The “gift” of equality, procured through state legislative enactments as an emblem of democratic justice, embodies true (legitimated) power that remains nervously secure in the hands of the majority.5 The ostensible empowerment of minority groups is a facade; it is the ruse of the majority gift. What exists, in fact, is a simulacrum (Baudrillard, 1981, 1983) of equality (and by extension, democratic justice): a pseudo-sign image (a hypertext or simulation) of real sociopolitical progress.¶ For the future relationship between equality and the social to more fully embrace minority sensibilities, calculated legal reform efforts in the name of equality must be displaced and the rule and authority of the status quo must be decentered. Imaginable, calculable equality is self-limiting and self-referential. Ultimately, it is always (at least) one step removed from true equality and, therefore, true justice.6T

he ruse of the majority gift currently operates under the assumption of a presumed empowerment, which it confers on minority populations. Yet, the presented power is itself circumscribed by the stifling horizons of majority rule with their effects. Thus, the gift can only be construed as falsely eudemonic: An avaricious, although insatiable, pursuit of narcissistic legitimacy supporting majority directives.¶