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#### Shut down nearly decimated investor confidence in Mexican export industry—

Paterson 10-11-13 Kent Paterson, Frontera NorteSur // October 11, 2013 // Business & Technology “U.S. crisis unsettles Mexico” [http://newspapertree.com/articles/2013/10/11/us-crisis-unsettles-mexico] [MG]

The partial shutdown of the U.S. government is unsettling the Mexican economy. As the crisis took shape last week, the Mexican peso dipped to 13.34 units per dollar, an amount which represented the second largest depreciation in 2013. The pending October 17 showdown over the U.S. debt limit is likewise contributing to the jitters, said Gabriela Siller, an analyst for Mexico-based Banco Base. In the Mexico-U.S. border region, Mexican business leaders expressed worry that the political gridlock on the Potomac could deepen and trigger devastating consequences on the assembly-for-export, or maquiladora, industry. In Ciudad Juarez and other border cities, the foreign-owned maquiladora sector constitutes a dominant or major part of the economy. Longer export times, reduced market demand and idled assembly lines are among the concerns voiced by Ciudad Juarez business representatives. “The economy is flowing at the moment, but we don’t know how it is going to behave at the end of the year,” said Rodolfo Martinez Garza, president of the Association of Customs Agents in Ciudad Juarez. Martinez added that the last quarter of the year is the biggest season of import-export activity, and that unstable economic circumstances could result in stagnation. “There is a lot of uncertainty for investment and this is very negative for Ciudad Juarez,” Martinez said. According to Mexico’s National Council of the Maquiladora Industry and Export Manufacturing, any effects of the U.S. shutdown should be measurable in industrial production after October 20. Thomas Fullerton, economist for the University of Texas at El Paso, said the impacts of the U.S. government shutdown on the maquildora industry – which also supports thousands of jobs in his city – could be worse than the previous one in 1995-96 because of the still-incomplete recovery from the 2008 economic crash. The U.S. crisis comes at a time when worries already exist over the state of the Mexican economy and the tax reform looming in the Mexican Congress, including a possible hike in the border region sales tax from its current 11 percent to 16 percent. In Ciudad Juarez, many business, community and political leaders oppose the sales tax hike and warn of an outflow of pesos to neighboring Texas and New Mexico, where sales taxes are much lower, if the Mexican Congress increases the tax this fall under the proposal advanced by the Pena Nieto administration. This week, a coalition of popular organizations, tire and used car industry groups delivered at petition with 12,733 signatures against the sales tax hike to Congresswoman Martha Beatriz Cordoba. A member of the Citizen Movement party, Corboba has emerged as a leader against a higher tax. The political turmoil and debates in both Washington and Mexico City occur at a moment when indicators reveal some adverse trends in the Mexican economy. On October 8, the International Monetary Fund projected that Mexico’s 2013 growth rate would be a mere 1.2 percent – far less than the growth in the 3 percent range widely predicted earlier in the year. In the Latin American and Caribbean group of nations, Mexico’s growth performance puts it in the same general camp this year as Brazil, Venezuela and Jamaica. Agustin de la Torre, chief economist for the World Bank, was surprised by the weak Mexican growth report. “We do not have an easy explanation on why Mexico did not recuperate,” de la Torre said. “Without a doubt, there is an enormous contrast between the perception that investors have of Mexico in light of structural reforms on the one hand and the low growth this year on the other.”

#### Neito tax reform uniquely places sustainability at risk—

Replogle 9-20-13 Jill Replogle, Fronteras Reporter, KPBS “Mexico Fiscal Reform Could Be Bad For Maquiladoras” [<http://www.kpbs.org/news/2013/sep/20/mexico-fiscal-reform-could-be-bad-maquiladoras/>] [MG]

The maquiladora export industry that’s a key component of the U.S.-Mexico border economy could face major changes under proposed reforms to Mexico’s tax system. Mexico currently collects fewer taxes from its citizens and companies than almost any other developed country. Mexico relies heavily on revenues from its state-run oil industry, which is in decline. Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto wants to change this. One way he wants to do it is by tightening control over the country’s vast maquiladora export industry. Factories that make and export goods to the U.S. and other foreign markets currently don’t pay taxes on their raw materials and machinery. But that would change under the proposed reform. Maquiladoras would have to pay the normal 16 percent sales tax on their raw materials and then request a refund of that money when they export the final product. That would require exporters to invest a lot more cash up front, said Héctor Vega, a tax partner with Deloitte Mexico. It could erase some of the advantage Mexico has over its manufacturing competitors, Vega said. “Because we are very close to the U.S., it’s very natural doing business,” he said. “However, this 16 percent will impact a lot and maybe determinate where you put your investment, either in China, either in Vietnam, either in Malaysia or keep it in Mexico.” Still, Vega is hopeful that the tax change affecting maquiladoras will ultimately be stripped from the final fiscal reform bill.

#### Collapse threatens national security—altering engagement policy is critical to sustain it

Rapiey ‘11 Stanley Joseph Rapiey, Department of Defense Civilian “Maquiladoras and National Security: Design Theory as a Guide.” 25, October, 2011 [MG]

The Mexican maquiladora industry is rapidly losing market share to Asian competitors that dramatically undercut them in terms of labor cost. The decline of these assembly-for-export factories will result in instability along the U.S.-Mexico border and will prove to be a serious national security issue for the United States. This paper leverages Design theory to frame the problems surrounding Mexico’s maquiladora industry in order to develop an understanding of this complex adaptive system. It examines the wide range of actors involved in the system, focusing on their goals, motivations and conflicting tendencies. Finally, the paper recommends courses of action for U.S. and Mexican leaders that will mitigate the resulting instability in the Mexican northern border states. The economic stability of Mexico will always be a national security priority for the United States. The two nations share a border of nearly 2,000 miles, and trade between them is worth billions of dollars. To take advantage of this relationship, the Mexican government created a series of customs and trade policies specifically designed to enhance its economic ties to the U.S. For decades, such policies greatly benefited Mexico’s maquiladoras, factories that import raw materials, rapidly combine them into finished products, and export them to the American market. Unfortunately for Mexico, the strong advantages in low-cost labor and speedy delivery are gradually being eroded by similar programs in China and Southeast Asia. As U.S. companies look to Asia for more profitable business relationships, the Mexican government has done little to alter its customs and trade policies in response. A severe economic blow to the maquiladoras along the U.S. border would have dramatic effects on the stability of the area, affecting both Mexican and American national security interests. The governments of Mexico and the United States should therefore take preemptive measures to mitigate the instability that is arising as the maquiladoras lose their viability under new global economic pressures. These measures include altering customs and trade policies, providing economic incentives in order to transform the Mexican export industry, and creating labor opportunities for Mexicans within the United States. In order to support this thesis, the following paper will leverage Design Theory to examine the current situation in the Mexican maquiladora industry, identify problems in terms of potential impacts to U.S. national security, and propose possible courses of action for both American and Mexican decision-makers.

#### This threatens the entire relationship and causes industries to shift toward China—

Rapiey ‘11 Stanley Joseph Rapiey, Department of Defense Civilian “Maquiladoras and National Security: Design Theory as a Guide.” 25, October, 2011

The Problem Frame highlights the issues that must be addressed in order to transform current conditions into the desired end state.25 In this case, the desired end state is a more stable economy in the northern Mexican states, free from the current stress brought about by the decline in the maquiladora industry. Since 60% of Mexican maquiladoras operate in the border states, this end state is a key factor in the stability of the border area for both the United States and Mexico.26 Additionally, 80% of all Mexican exports are to the United States, making this relationship extremely important.27 It is in the best interest of these nations to take action to reach this end state. In order to develop future courses of action that create conditions conducive for the desired end state, the current challenges that currently exist in this system must be examined. The three major challenges to reaching the desired end state are connected to flaws in the Mexican export industry, specifically its inability to respond to global competition, its overreliance on the American market, and its lack of complexity. A fourth challenge is connected to the free flow of labor in this region. These challenges are obstacles in the path to a stable and secure northern Mexico. First of all, Mexico’s response to increased competition for its maquiladoras has been completely inadequate. Over the past decade, China has presented an attractive alternative to Mexican maquiladoras in terms of labor costs. In 2008, Chinese hourly manufacturing wages were estimated nearly 75% cheaper than those in Mexico.28 For over a decade, Chinese factories have been able to assemble goods of equal quality as the maquiladoras, but now they can provide greater quality control and better physical infrastructure.29 As drug violence continues in Mexico, security has become a greater decision point for businesses as well, and many are concerned that investing in Mexico is a risk.30 Mexico’s two main responses to this situation have been extremely inadequate and have not improved the overall situation. The Mexican government’s first response was to escalate anti-Chinese rhetoric, even working to delay China’s entry into the World Trade Organization.31 This merely delayed the inevitable and resolved nothing. Later, driven by the need to compete with China, Mexican factories laid off personnel and cut worker salaries in order to reduce labor costs.32 Considering the weak global economy, this unfortunate move added pressure to an already-stressed workforce. The resultant increases in unemployment and underemployment, combined with reduced salaries, will increase instability in the region as people are driven to crime, either as victims or participants.33

#### Scenario A—is China

#### US reliance on Chinese technology for military purposes undermines its capability and allows for Chinese espionage

Snyder 5/29/13 – (Michael, “Why The Next War With China Could Go Very Badly For The United States”, http://www.infowars.com/why-the-next-war-with-china-could-go-very-badly-for-the-united-states/)//javi

Another way that China is gaining a strategic advantage over the U.S. is by getting the U.S. military to become increasingly dependent upon them. According to Forbes, now the U.S. military is even leasing a Chinese satellite for communications purposes… American dependence on China grows by the day. The latestnews is that the United States has been reduced to leasing a Chinese satellite to handle communications with U.S. military bases in Africa. Surprising, isn’t it? The nation that launched the world’s first communications satellite (I remember it well – it was called Telstar) has so lost its manufacturing mojo that it has to rely on its most formidable military adversary to provide the hardware for some of its most sensitive communications. This at a time when underlying unemployment rates among U.S. manufacturing workers remain at near-depression levels. Isn’t that crazy? And a recent Senate report discovered that many of our most advanced weapons systems are absolutely riddled with counterfeit Chinese parts… A recent Senate report, titled Inquiry Into Counterfeit Electronic Parts In The Department Of Defense Supply Chain, “uncovered overwhelming evidence of large numbers of counterfeit parts making their way into critical defense systems.” The investigation found 1,800 cases of counterfeit electronic parts involving over one million suspect parts in 2009-10 alone, thereby exposing “a defense supply chain that relies on hundreds of unveiled independent distributors to supply electronic parts for some of our most sensitive systems.” The report concluded, among other things, that China is the “dominant source” of counterfeit products that enter the DoD supply chain, that the Chinese government does little to stop it and that the DoD doesn’t know the “scope and impact” of these parts on critical defense systems. Who in the world would be stupid enough to allow one of their greatest strategic enemies to supply large numbers of parts for key weapons systems? Apparently we are that stupid. Things are particularly bad when it comes to semiconductors… Senator John McCain commented: “We can’t tolerate the risk of a ballistic missile interceptor failing to hit its target, a helicopter pilot unable to fire his missiles, or any other mission failure because of a counterfeit part.” Calling the issue “a ticking time bomb,” Brian Toohey, president of the Semiconductor Industry Association, commented: “The catastrophic failure risk inherently found in counterfeit semiconductors places our citizens and military personnel in unreasonable peril.” It would be bad enough if we just had to worry about counterfeit parts failing. But what if China has a way to shut some of those parts down in the event of a conflict? What if some of those parts contain “Trojan Horse” computer chips or malware? That may sound crazy, but unfortunately Trojan Horse chips can be extremely difficult to detect. The following is from a recent Forbes article… As the Defense Science Board pointed out, Trojan Horse circuitry is almost impossible to detect even with the most rigorous analysis. This is particularly so if a saboteur can accomplish matching subversions in both software and relevant hardware.

#### Chinese espionage is the biggest internal link to Chinese military modernization

U.S.-China ESRC 7 – U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission[Report to Congress-The Commission was made up of members of the 110th Congress, 1st Session, November, <http://www.uscc.gov/annual_report/2007/report_to_congress.pdf>  
The pace and success of China’s military modernization continue to exceed U.S. government estimates. Indeed, on occasion the U.S. defense and intelligence communities have been taken by surprise, 7 as in the case of the launching of the Jin class submarine by the navy of the People’s Liberation Army. China’s defense industry is producing new generations of weapon platforms with impressive speed and quality, and these advancements are due in part to the highly effective manner in which Chinese defense companies are integrating commercial technologies into military systems. Additionally, industrial espionage provides Chinese companies an added source of new technology without the necessity of investing time or money to perform research. Chinese espionage in the United States, which now comprises the single greatest threat to U.S. technology, is straining the U.S. counterintelligence establishment. This illicit activity significantly contributes to China’s military modernization and acquisition of new capabilities.

#### US can no longer win the war due to Chinese tech advancement through espionage

Snyder 5/29/13 – (Michael, “Why The Next War With China Could Go Very Badly For The United States”, http://www.infowars.com/why-the-next-war-with-china-could-go-very-badly-for-the-united-states/)//javi

Most Americans assume that the U.S. military is so vastly superior to everyone else that no other nation would ever dream of fighting a full-scale war against us. Unfortunately, that assumption is dead wrong. In recent years, the once mammoth technological gap between the U.S. military and the Chinese military has been closing at a frightening pace. China has been accomplishing this by brazenly stealing our technology and hacking into our computer systems. The Pentagon and the Obama administration know all about this, but they don’t do anything about it. Perhaps the fact that China owns about a trillion dollars of our national debt has something to do with that. In any event, today China has the largest military in the world and the second largest military budget in the world. They have stolen plans for our most advanced jets, helicopters, ships and missile systems. It is estimated that stealing our technology has saved China about 25 years of research and development. In addition, China is rapidly developing a new generation of strategic weapons that could potentially enable it to actually win a future war against the United States. At one time such a notion would have been unthinkable, but as you will see below, the next war with China could go very badly for the United States.

#### Chinese military modernization causes nuclear war

Twomey 9, co-directs the Center for Contemporary Conflict and is an assistant professor in the Department of National Security Affairs, both @ the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, CA, 9 [Christopher, Arms Control Association, “Chinese-U.S. Strategic Affairs: Dangerous Dynamism, http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2009\_01-02/china\_us\_dangerous\_dynamism#Twomey]

China and the United States are not in a strategic weapons arms race. Nonetheless, their modernization and sizing decisions increasingly are framed with the other in mind. Nuclear weapons are at the core of this interlocking pattern of development. In particular, China is the only permanent member of the UN Security Council expanding its arsenal; it is also enhancing its arsenal. The basic facts of Chinese strategic modernization are well known, if the details remain frustratingly opaque. China is deploying road-mobile, solid-fueled missiles, giving it a heighted degree of security in its second-strike capability. It is beginning to deploy ballistic missile submarines (SSBNs). It is researching a wide range of warhead and delivery systems technologies that will lead to increased accuracy and, more pointedly, increased penetration against ballistic missile defenses. The size of China's deliverable arsenal against the United States will undoubtedly increase beyond the few dozen that it possessed recently.[1] The pace of growth thus far has been moderate, although China has only recently developed reliable, survivable delivery systems. The final endpoint remains mired in opacity and uncertainty, although several score of deliverable warheads seems likely for the near term. These developments on the strategic side are coupled with elements of conventional modernization that impinge on the strategic balance.[2] The relevant issue, however, is not simply an evaluation of the Chinese modernization program, but rather an evaluation of the interaction of that modernization with U.S. capabilities and interests. U.S. capabilities are also changing. Under the provisions of START and SORT, the United States has continued to engage in quantitative reductions of its operational nuclear arsenal. At the same, there is ongoing updating of warhead guidance and fusing systems. Ballistic missile defense systems of a variety of footprints are being deployed. The U.S. SSBN force now leans more toward the Pacific than the Atlantic, reversing the Cold War deployment. Guam's capacity to support heavy bombers and attack submarines has been enhanced. Furthermore, advances in U.S. conventional weaponry have been so substantial that they too promise strategic effects: prompt global strike holds out the promise of a U.S. weapon on target anywhere in the world in less than an hour and B-2s with highly accurate weapons can sustain strategic effects over a campaign. What are the concerns posed by these two programs of dynamic strategic arsenals? Most centrally, the development of the strategic forces detailed above has increasingly assumed an interlocked form. The U.S. revolution in precision guided munitions was followed by an emphasis on mobility in the Chinese missile force. U.S. missile defense systems have clearly spurred an emphasis on countermeasures in China's ICBM force and quantitative buildups in its regional missile arsenals.[3] Beijing's new submarine-based forces further enhance the security of China's second-strike capability in the face of a potential U.S. strike but are likely to lead to increased attention to anti-submarine warfare in the United States. China's recent anti-satellite test provoked a U.S. demonstration of similar capabilities. Such reciprocal responses have the potential to move toward a tightly coupled arms race and certainly have already worsened threat perceptions on each side. The potential for conflict is not simply that of inadvertent escalation; there are conflicts of interests between the two. Heightening threat perceptions in that context greatly complicates diplomacy. Further, the dangers of inadvertent escalation have been exacerbated by some of these moves. Chinese SSBN deployment will stress an untested command-and-control system. Similar dangers in the Cold War were mitigated, although not entirely overcome, over a period of decades of development of personnel and technical solutions. China appears to have few such controls in place today. U.S. deployment of highly accurate nuclear warheads is consistent with a first-strike doctrine and seems sized for threats larger than "rogue" nations. These too would undermine stability in an intense crisis.

#### Scenario B is the F-35

#### Production of the F-35 is uncertain – sequestration cuts

Capaccio 8/1/13 – (“Canceling Lockheed F-35 Said to Be Among Pentagon Options”, Bloomberg, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-08-01/canceling-lockheed-f-35-said-to-be-among-pentagon-options.html)//javi

Canceling the $391.2 billion program to build Lockheed Martin Corp. (LMT)’s F-35 fighter jet is among options the Pentagon listed in its “strategic review” of choices if forced to live with automatic budget cuts, according to people familiar with Defense Department briefings. The F-35 was a program listed for potential elimination in charts at briefings held July 31 by the Defense Department, according to the people, who asked not to be identified discussing the closed-door sessions. Scrapping the fighter wasn’t among options disclosed to reporters that day by Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel as he outlined in broad terms results of the review he ordered of alternative approaches if the military must continue to absorb about $50 billion a year in cuts under the process known as sequestration. Hagel indicated the Pentagon may have to choose between a “much smaller force” and a decade-long “holiday” from modernizing weapons systems and technology. “We have gone to great lengths to stress that this review identified, through a rigorous process of strategic modeling, possible decisions we might face under scenarios we may or may not face in the future,” Pentagon spokesman George Little said in an e-mailed statement. “Any suggestion that we’re now moving away from key modernization programs as a result of yesterday’s discussion of the outcomes of the review would be incorrect.” Protecting F-35 The F-35 is the Pentagon’s costliest weapon system, with the estimated price tag of $391.2 billion for a fleet of 2,443 aircraft, up 68 percent from the projection in 2001, as measured in current dollars. The rising costs and troubles in building the plane as it’s still being developed have led to criticism in Congress. The Pentagon moved to protect the F-35 from sequestration’s initial impact this year, locking in several contracts before the cuts took effect. Frank Kendall, the Defense Department’s chief weapons buyer, has said he will continue to do his best to protect the plane built by Bethesda, Maryland-based Lockheed in the future. Based on that track record, “the implication is that any ‘option’ to kill the program is an academic exercise rather than a serious possibility,” according to Loren Thompson, a defense analyst with the nonprofit Arlington, Virginia-based Lexington Institute. Thompson wasn’t briefed on the charts. While the Pentagon and its supporters have lobbied for relief from sequestration, President Barack Obama and congressional leaders aren’t engaged in active efforts to find an alternative to the automatic cuts.

#### Mexican production is key to US F-35s

Samra 13 – (Elena Achar Head of the Export Promotion Unit Alejandro Delgado Ayala Head of the Institutional Relations and Support Unit Carlos Eduardo Sánchez Pavón Head of the Investment and International Business Promotion Unit Martín Felipe Valenzuela Rivera Head of the Business Inteligence Unit Karla Mawcinitt Bueno Communications and Image General Coordinator Sebastián Escalante Bañuelos Director of Publications and Content, "Mexico's Aerospace Industry Road Map", ProMexico, June 2013, [www.promexico.gob.mx/work/models/promexico/Resource/1985/1/images/ROAD-MAP-Aerospace-2013.pdf](http://www.promexico.gob.mx/work/models/promexico/Resource/1985/1/images/ROAD-MAP-Aerospace-2013.pdf))//javi

In the defense aerospace sector, there is a trend toward association between countries to manufacture combat aircraft. Switzerland cooperates with Sweden in the development of the next generation Saab Gripen. Indonesia has joined the South Korean KFX combat aircraft program, while Turkey is looking for a partner country for its TFX combat aircraft program. The sales forecast will be dominated by the Joint Strike Fighter Lockheed Martin F-35, a project with a growing customer portfolio, with the partnership of 9 countries: United States, United Kingdom, Italy, Netherlands, Turkey, Canada, Denmark, Norway and Australia, scheduled for completion in 2019. Progress in the development of the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter will be crucial for the constant concern of international partners regarding escalating costs, a key factor in the aerospace industry where Mexico can be acknowledged as a strategic option. Based on data from Aviation Week, Lockheed Martin has confirmed orders from more than 15 countries for 340 Hercules C-130 units. There are new competitors around the manufacture of this aircraft, so that delivery on time for these orders will be central to the company. In this segment, the Embraer KC-390, the Chinese plane Shaanxi Y-9, the Medium Transport Aircraft (MTA) Russian/Indian and A400M are the main competitors. With regard to helicopters, the seven countries behind the Eurocopter Typhoon are expected to grant a development contract for an AESA (Active Electronically Scanned Array) to the Selex Galileo Euroradar consortium as of 2013. On the other hand, the U.S. has commissioned Bell to replace the use of Apache AH-64E helicopters with an update. In Europe, Britain and France spend about the same percentage of GDP on defense, and together account for half of the continent’s military expenditure and their armed forces are of a similar nature. Both nations are cooperating in individual programs, such as the unmanned (UAV) Watchkeeper reconnaissance aircraft. They have made progress in the field of cyber defense and share research objectives of the English Taranis and the French Neuron aircraft. In this context of intense activity in the international scene, the development and construction of commercial and defense aircraft faces challenges of cost reduction and an emphasis on innovation, design and materials through a reliable supply chain, where Mexico emerges as a great opportunity.

#### F-35s are key to power projection

Ivey 11 (Kay, Lieutenant Governor of Alabama, May, http://ltgov.alabama.gov/PR/PressRelease.aspx?ID=5143&t=28)

Wilbur Wright once said, “It is possible to fly without motors, but not without knowledge and skill.” Recognizing education was essential to success, the Wright brothers founded the first flight school in the United States on the grounds of what would one day become Maxwell Air Force Base. Those early investments resonate today, as many Alabama higher education institutions carry on that same tradition of excellence with the next generation of pilots, engineers and astronauts. But the ability for tomorrow’s graduates to use the knowledge and skill they cultivate from these highly-specialized programs means they have to have jobs in which to use them. That’s why supporting multi-service programs such as the F-35 joint strike fighter are essential. The F-35 program is essential to our national defense needs and the needs of our allies. China, Russia and other countries continue to invest in developing planes with cutting edge technology. If we don’t make the same investments, we will fall behind. The F-35 is required to be four times more effective than older fighter jets in air-to-air combat, eight times more effective in air-to-ground combat, and three times more effective in reconnaissance and suppression of air defenses – while having better range and requiring less logistics support. In light of the increase in the number of issues we are facing in the Middle East and places like Libya, America’s ability to retain its air superiority edge is essential to the security of US and allies forces all over the world.

#### Even if conflict occurs, F-35s solve the terminal impact – they are key to conflict de-escalation

Schuman, TIME, 7-6-’11 (Michael, “Will America's budget deficit bring an end to world peace?” http://curiouscapitalist.blogs.time.com/2011/07/06/will-america%E2%80%99s-budget-deficit-bring-an-end-to-world-peace/)

Did you know that the U.S. still stations nearly 50,000 troops in Japan? That's pretty amazing when you think about it. The war in the Pacific ended 66 years ago, and there hasn't been a conflict in Northeast Asia since the Korean War of the early 1950s, but America still maintains a hefty military presence in the area. Another bunch of soldiers are parked nearby in South Korea. Why in the world are all those soldiers still there? They're keeping the peace. Not everybody may agree with me on that assertion. I can't imagine Kim Jong Il is too happy that tens of thousands of armed Americans are sitting on his doorstep. But most of the leadership of Asia fully realizes that the U.S. military presence in the region has, without question, provided a stability rarely experienced. The traditional rivalries between local powers (China, Japan and Korea) have been kept at bay. American security allowed Japan, South Korea and most of the rest of the region (including China) to focus on economic development and alleviating poverty. It is because America ensured peace in East Asia that Asians have been able to get rich. People all over the world have benefited in a similar way. American security for Western Europe during the Cold War allowed the region to rebuild after World War II. The American security relationship with Saudi Arabia and its allies in the Persian Gulf has helped oil to flow peacefully to the world. Year after year, it is American armed forces that most often take the lead in resolving the world's security issues, whether that has meant stopping genocide in the Balkans or hunting down Osama bin Laden in Pakistan. Sure, America's military dominance has produced a fair share of hostility, in Iran, Libya and other countries that have refused to join the U.S.-led global political and security system. And of course the U.S. has made its share of blunders when flexing its military muscle (Iraq). But the fact is that the world expects America to use its armed forces to solve the world's problems. When Washington takes a backseat and lets others drive for a while – as in the current conflict in Libya – the White House faces stiff criticism.

#### F-35’s key to deterrence and air-to-ground superiority

Schorsch 9/20/13 – (Peter, “Rep. Kay Granger says F-35 fighter key to meeting global threats”, Saint Peters, http://www.saintpetersblog.com/rep-kay-granger-says-f-35-fighter-key-to-meeting-global-threats)//javi

Each passing month, the United States falls dangerously behind in preparation to meet increasing global threats, warns U.S. Rep. Kay Granger from Texas. With an ever more dangerous and less certain world, maintaining air superiority is the key to success in any future conflict, writes the Republican chair of the Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations in an op-ed piece for the Aerospace/Defense Special Edition of theWashington Times. Granger says the current 4th Generation fighters, or “legacy fleet,” are simply insufficient to engage Russia and China in possible future conflicts. Our fleet of F-15s, F-16s, AV-8s, A-10s and F/A-18s, are aging rapidly, while both air-to-air and air-to-ground threats escalate at a similar pace. In addition, cutbacks have reduced the 5th Generation F-22 fighters to 187 planes, ensuring America’s lack of airpower to meet demands. According to Granger, America owes it to our children and grandchildren to remain the best-equipped and strongest nation, as a way to preserve peace and prosperity. She calls for the continued development of the U.S. F-35 stealth fighter, to compete with similar technology currently under development by China and Russia. Russia is actively developing its version of the stealth fighter to sell on the world market — the PAK/FA T-50. China is doing the same with its own J-20 and J-31 prototypes. The advanced technology of the F-35 stealth can be the cornerstone of a family of fighters, including the F-22, which will provide essential air support for ground troops, or for attacking distant targets.

#### Only deterrence is an empirically verifiable solution to war

Moore 04 – Dir. Center for Security Law @ University of Virginia, 7-time Presidential appointee, & Honorary Editor of the American Journal of International Law, Solving the War Puzzle: Beyond the Democratic Peace, John Norton Moore, page 27-31.

As so broadly conceived, there is strong evidence that deterrence, that is, the effect of external factors on the decision to go to war, is the missing link in the war/peace equation. In my War/Peace Seminar, I have undertaken to examine the level of deterrence before the principal wars of the twentieth century.10 This examination has led me to believe that in every case the potential aggressor made a rational calculation that the war would be won, and won promptly.11 In fact, the longest period of time calculated for victory through conventional attack seems to be the roughly six reeks predicted by the German General Staff as the time necessary ) prevail on the Western front in World War I under the Schlieffen Plan. Hitler believed in his attack on Poland that Britain and France could not take the occasion to go to war with him. And he believed his 1941 Operation Barbarossa against the Soviet Union that “[w]e have only to kick in the door and the whole rotten structure will come crashing down."12 In contrast, following Hermann Goering's failure to obtain air superiority in the Battle of Britain, Hitler called off the invasion of Britain and shifted strategy to the nighttime bombing of population centers, which became known as the Blitz, in a mistaken effort to compel Britain to sue for peace. Calculations in the North Korean attack on South Korea and Hussein’s attack on Kuwait were that the operations would be completed in a matter of days. Indeed, virtually all principal wars in the twentieth century, at least those involving conventional invasion,were preceded by what I refer to as a "double deterrence absence." That is, the potential aggressor believed that they had the military force in place to prevail promptly and that nations that might have the military or diplomatic power to prevent this were not dined to intervene. This analysis has also shown that many of the perceptions we have about the origins of particular wars are flatly wrong. Anyone who seriously believes that World War I was begun by competing alliances drawing tighter should examine the al historical record of British unwillingness to enter a clear military alliance with the French or to so inform the Kaiser! Indeed, this pre-World War I absence of effective alliance and resultant war contrasts sharply with the laterrobust NATO alliance and absence of World War III.14 Considerable other evidence seems to support this historical analysis as to the importance of deterrence. Of particular note, Yale Professor Donald Kagan, a preeminent United States historian who has long taught a seminar on war, published in 1995 a superb book On the Origins of War and the Preservation of Peace.15 In this book heconducts a detailed examination of the Peloponnesian War, World War I, Hannibal's War, and World War II, among other case studies. A careful reading of these studies suggests that each war could have been prevented by achievable deterrence and that each occurred in the absence of such deterrence. Game theory seems to offer yet further support for the proposition that appropriate deterrence can prevent war. For example, Robert Axelrod's famous 1980s experiment in an iterated prisoner's dilemma, which is a reasonably close proxy for many conflict settings in international relations, repeatedly showed the effectiveness of a simple tit for tat strategy.17Such a strategy is at core simply a basic deterrent strategy of influencing behavior through incentives. Similarly, much of the game-theoretic work on crisis bargaining (and danger of asymmetric information) in relation to war and the democratic peace assumes the importance of deterrence through communication of incentives.18 The well-known correlation between war and territorial contiguity seems also to underscore the importance of deterrence and is likely principally a proxy for levels of perceived profit and military achievability of aggression in many such settings. It should further be noted that the democratic peace is not the only significant correlation with respect to war and peace, although it seems to be the most robust. Professors Russett and Oneal, in recently exploring the other elements of the Kantian proposal for "Perpetual Peace," have also shown a strong and statistically significant correlation between economically important bilateral trade between two nations and a reduction in the risk of war between them. Contrary to the arguments of "dependency theorists," such economically important trade seems to reduce the risk of war regardless of the size relationship or asymmetry in the trade balance between the two states. In addition, there is a statistically significant association between economic openness generally and reduction in the risk of war, although this association is not as strong as the effect of an economically important bilateral trade relationship.° Russett and Oneal also show a modest independent correlation between reduction in the risk of war and higher levels of common membership in international organizations.20 And they show that a large imbalance of power between two states significantly lessens the risk of major war between them.21 All of these empirical findings about war also seem to directly reflect incentives; that is, a higher level of trade would, if foregone in war, impose higher costs in the aggregate than without such trade,22 though we know that not all wars terminate trade. Moreover, with respect to trade, a, classic study, Economic Interdependence and War, suggests that the historic record shows that it is not simply aggregate levels of bilateral trade that matters, but expectations as to the level of trade into the future.23 This directly implicates expectations of the war decision maker as does incentive theory, and it importantly adds to the general finding about trade and war that even with existing high levels of bilateral trade, changing expectations from trade sanctions or other factors affecting the flow of trade can directly affect incentives and influence for or against war. A large imbalance of power in a relationship rather obviously impacts deterrence and incentives. Similarly, one might incur higher costs with high levels of common membership in international organizations through foregoing some of the heightened benefits of such participation or otherwise being presented with different options through the actions or effects of such organizations. These external deterrence elements may also be yet another reason why democracies have a lower risk of war with one another. For their freer markets, trade, commerce, and international engagement may place them in a position where their generally higher level of interaction means that aggression will incur substantial opportunity costs. Thus, the "mechanism" of the democratic peace may be an aggregate of factors affecting incentives, both external as well as internal factors. Because of the underlying truth in the relationship between higher levels of trade and lower levels of war, it is not surprising that theorists throughout human history, including Baron de Montesquieu in 1748, Thomas Paine in 1792, John Stuart Mill in 1848, and, most recently, the founders of the European Union, have argued that increasing commerce and interactions among nations would end war. Though by themselves these arguments have been overoptimistic, it may well be that some level of "globalization" may make the costs of war and the gains of peace so high as to powerfully predispose to peace. Indeed, a 1989 book by John Mueller, Retreat From Doomsday,24 postulates the obsolescence of major war between developed nations (at least those nations within the "first and second worlds") as they become increasingly conscious of the rising costs of war and the rising gains of peace. In assessing levels of democracy, there are indexes readily available, for example, the Polity III25 and Freedom House 26 indexes. I am unaware of any comparable index with respect to levels of deterrence that might be used to test the importance of deterrence in war avoidance?' Absent such an accepted index, discussion about the importance of deterrence is subject to the skeptical observation that one simply defines effective deterrence by whether a war did or did not occur. In order to begin to deal with this objection and encourage a more objective methodology for assessing deterrence, I encouraged a project to seek to develop a rough but objective measure of deterrence with a scale from minus ten to plus ten based on a large variety of contextual features that would be given relative weighting in a complex deterrence equation before applying the scaling to different war and nonwar settings.28 On the disincentive side of the scale, the methodology used a weighted calculation of local deterrence, including the chance to prevent a short- and intermediate-term military victory, and economic and political disincentives; extended deterrence with these same elements; and contextual communication and credibility multipliers. On the incentive side of the scale, the methodology also used a weighted calculation of perceived military, economic, and political benefits. The scales were then combined into an overall deterrence score, including, an estimate for any effect of prospect theory where applicable.2 This innovative first effort uniformly showed high deterrence scores in settings where war did not, in fact, occur. Deterring a Soviet first strike in the Cuban Missile Crisis produced a score of +8.5 and preventing a Soviet attack against NATO produced a score of +6. War settings, however, produced scores ranging from -2.29 (Saddam Hussein's decision to invade Kuwait in the Gulf War), -2.18 (North Korea's decision to invade South Korea in the Korean War), -1.85 (Hitler's decision to invade Poland in World War II), -1.54 (North Vietnam's decision to invade South Vietnam following the Paris Accords), -0.65 (Milosevic's decision to defy NATO in Kosovo), +0.5 (the Japanese decision to attack Pearl Harbor), +1.25 (the Austrian decision, egged on by Germany, to attack Serbia, which was the real beginning of World War I), to +1.75 (the German decision to invade Belgium and France in World War I). As a further effort at scaling and as a point of comparison, I undertook to simply provide an impressionistic rating based on my study of each pre-crisis setting. That produced high positive scores of +9 for both deterring a Soviet first strike during the Cuban Missile Crisis and NATO's deterrence of a Warsaw Pact attack and even lower scores than the more objective effort in settings where wars had occurred. Thus, I scored North Vietnam's decision to invade South Vietnam following the Paris Accords and the German decision to invade Poland at the beginning of World War II as -6; the North Korean/Stalin decision to invade South Korea in the Korean War as -5; the Iraqi decision to invade the State of Kuwait as -4; Milosevic's decision to defy NATO in Kosovo and the German decision to invade Belgium and France in World War I as -2; and the Austrian decision to attack Serbia and the Japanese decision to attack Pearl Harbor as -1. Certainly even knowledgeable experts would be likely to differ in their impressionistic scores on such pre-crisis settings, and the effort at a more objective methodology for scoring deterrence leaves much to be desired. Nevertheless, both exercises did seem to suggest that deterrence matters and that high levels of deterrence can prevent future war. Following up on this initial effort to produce a more objective measure of deterrence, two years later I encouraged another project to undertake the same effort, building on what had been learned in the first iteration. The result was a second project that developed a modified scoring system, also incorporating local deterrence, extended deterrence, and communication of intent and credibility multipliers on one side of a scale, and weighing these factors against a potential aggressor's overall subjective incentives for action on the other side of the scale.3° The result, with a potential range of -5.5 to +10, produced no score higher than +2.5 for eighteen major wars studied between 1939 and the 1990 Gulf War.31 Twelve of the eighteen wars produced a score of zero or below, with the 1950-53 Korean War at -3.94, the 1965-75 Vietnam War at -0.25, the 1980-88 Iran-Iraq War at -1.53, and the 1990-91 Gulf War at -3.83. The study concluded that in more than fifty years of conflict there was "no situation in which a regime elite/decision making body subjectively faced substantial disincentives to aggressive military action and yet attacked."32 Yet another piece of the puzzle, which may clarify the extent of deterrence necessary in certain settings, may also assist in building a broader hypothesis about war. In fact, it has been incorporated into the just-discussed efforts at scoring deterrence. That is, newer studies of human behavior from cognitive psychology are increasingly showing that certain perceptions of decision makers can influence the level of risk they may be willing to undertake, or otherwise affect their decisions.33 It now seems likely that a number of such insights about human behavior in decision making may be useful in considering and fashioning deterrence strategies. Perhaps of greatest relevance is the insight of "prospect theory," which posits that individuals evaluate outcomes with respect to deviations from a reference point and that they may be more risk averse in settings posing potential gain than in settings posing potential loss.34 The evidence of this "cognitive bias," whether in gambling, trading, or, as is increasingly being argued, foreign policy decisions generally, is significant. Because of the newness of efforts to apply a laboratory based "prospect theory" to the complex foreign policy process generally, and particularly ambiguities and uncertainties in framing such complex events, our consideration of it in the war/peace process should certainly be cautious. It does, however, seem to elucidate some of the case studies. In the war/peace setting, "prospect theory" suggests that deterrence may not need to be as strong to prevent aggressive action leading to perceived gain. For example, there is credible evidence that even an informal warning to Kaiser Wilhelm II from British Foreign Secretary Sir Edward Grey, if it had come early in the crisis before events had moved too far, might have averted World War I. And even a modicum of deterrence in Kuwait, as was provided by a small British contingent when Kuwait was earlier threatened by an irredentist Iraqi government in 1961, might have been sufficient to deter Saddam Hussein from his 1990 attack on Kuwait. Similarly, even a clear United States pledge for the defense of South Korea before the attack might have prevented the Korean War. Conversely, following the July 28 Austrian mobilization and declaration of war against Serbia in World War I, the issue for Austria may have begun to be perceived as loss avoidance, thus requiring much higher levels of deterrence to avoid the resulting war. Similarly, the Rambouillet Agreement may have been perceived by Milosevic as risking loss of Kosovo and his continued rule of Serbia and, as a result, may have required higher levels of NA-TO deterrence to have prevented Milosevic's actions in defiance. Certainly NATO's previous hesitant responses in 1995 against Milosevic in the Bosnia phase of the Yugoslav crisis and in 1998-99 in early attempts to deal with Kosovo did not create a high level of deterrence.35 One can only surmise whether the killing in Kosovo could have been avoided had NATO taken a different tack, both structuring the issue less as loss avoidance for Milosevic and considerably enhancing deterrence. Suppose, for example, NATO had emphasized that it had no interest in intervening in Serbia's civil conflict with the KLA but that it would emphatically take action to punish massive "ethnic cleansing" and other humanitarian outrages, as had been practiced in Bosnia. And on the deterrence side, it made clear in advance the severity of any NATO bombardment, the potential for introduction of ground troops if necessary, that in any assault it would pursue a "Leadership Strategy" focused on targets of importance to Milosevic and his principal henchmen (including their hold on power), and that it would immediately, unlike as earlier in Bosnia, seek to generate war crime indictments of all top Serbian leaders implicated in any atrocities. The point here is not to second-guess NATO's actions in Kosovo but to suggest that taking into account potential "cognitive bias," such as "prospect theory," may be useful in fashioning effective deterrence. "Prospect theory" may also have relevance in predicting that it may be easier to deter (that is, lower levels are necessary) an aggression than to undo that aggression. Thus, much higher levels of deterrence were probably required to compel Saddam Hussein to leave Kuwait than to prevent him initially from invading that state. In fact, not even the presence of a powerful Desert Storm military force and a Security Council Resolution directing him to leave caused Hussein to voluntarily withdraw. As this real-world example illustrates, there is considerable experimental evidence in "prospect theory" of an almost instant renormalization of reference point after a gain; that is, relatively quickly after Saddam Hussein took Kuwait, a withdrawal was framed as a loss setting, which he would take high risk to avoid. Indeed, we tend to think of such settings as settings of compellance, requiring higher levels of incentive to achieve compulsion producing an action, rather than deterrence needed for prevention. One should also be careful not to overstate the effect of "prospect theory" or to fail to assess a threat in its complete context. We should remember that a belated pledge of Great Britain to defend Poland before the Nazi attack did not deter Hitler, who believed under the circumstances that the British pledge would not be honored. It is also possible that the greater relative wealth of democracies, which have less to gain in all out war, is yet another internal factor contributing to the "democratic peace."36 In turn, this also supports the extraordinary tenacity and general record of success of democracies fighting in defensive settings as they may also have more to lose. In assessing adequacy of deterrence to prevent war, we might also want to consider whether extreme ideology, strongly at odds with reality, may be a factor requiring higher levels of deterrence for effectiveness. One example may be the extreme ideology of Pol Pot leading him to falsely believe that his Khmer Rouge forces could defeat Vietnam.37 He apparently acted on that belief in a series of border incursions against Vietnam that ultimately produced a losing war for him. Similarly, Osama bin Laden's 9/11 attack against America, hopelessly at odds with the reality of his defeating the Western World and producing for him a strategic disaster, seems to have been prompted by his extreme ideology rooted in a distorted concept of Islam at war with the enlightenment. The continuing suicide bombings against Israel, encouraged by radical rejectionists and leading to less and less for the Palestinians, may be another example. If extreme ideology is a factor to be considered in assessing levels of deterrence, it does not mean that deterrence is doomed to fail in such settings but only that it must be at higher levels (and properly targeted on the relevant decision elites behind the specific attacks) to be effective, as is also true in perceived loss or compellance settings.38 Even if major war in the modern world is predominantly a result of aggression by nondemocratic regimes, it does not mean that all nondemocracies pose a risk of war all, or even some, of the time. Salazar's Portugal did not commit aggression. Nor today do Singapore or Bahrain or countless other nondemocracies pose a threat. That is, today nondemocracy comes close to a necessary condition in generating the high risk behavior leading to major interstate war. But it is, by itself, not a sufficient condition for war. The many reasons for this, of course, include a plethora of internal factors, such as differences in leadership perspectives and values, size of military, and relative degree of the rule of law, as well as levels of external deterrence.39 But where an aggressive nondemocratic regime is present and poses a credible military threat, then it is the totality of external factors, that is, deterrence, that become crucial.

#### Deterrence breaks cycles of hostility and generates cooperation

Lupovici 08– Post-Doctoral Fellow Munk Centre for International Studies University of Toronto (Amir, “Why the Cold War Practices of Deterrence are Still Prevalent: Physical Security, Ontological Security and Strategic Discourse,”  [http://www.cpsa-acsp.ca/papers-2008/Lupovici.pdf](http://www.cpsa-acsp.ca/papers-2008/Lupovici.pdf" \t "_blank)

 Since deterrence can become part of the actors’ identity, it is also involved in the actors’ will to achieve ontological security, securing the actors’ identity and routines. As McSweeney explains, ontological security is “the acquisition of confidence in the routines of daily life—the essential predictability of interaction through which we feel confident in knowing what is going on and that we have the practical skill to go on in this context.” These routines become part of the social structure that enables and constrains the actors’ possibilities (McSweeney, 1999: 50-1, 154-5; Wendt, 1999: 131, 229-30). Thus, through the emergence of the deterrence norm and the construction of deterrence identities, the actors create an intersubjective context and intersubjective understandings that in turn affect their interests and routines. In this context, deterrence strategy and deterrence practices are better understood by the actors, and therefore the continuous avoidance of violence is more easily achieved. Furthermore, within such a context of deterrence relations, rationality is (re)defined, clarifying the appropriate practices for a rational actor, and this, in turn, reproduces this context and the actors’ identities.  Therefore, the internalization of deterrence ideas helps to explain how actors may create more cooperative practices and break away from the spiral of hostility that is forced and maintained by the identities that are attached to the security dilemma, and which lead to mutual perception of the other as an aggressive enemy. As Wendt for example suggests, in situations where states are restrained from using violence—such as MAD (mutual assured destruction)—states not only avoid violence, but “ironically, may be willing to trust each other enough to take on collective identity”. In such cases if actors believe that others have no desire to engulf them, then it will be easier to trust them and to identify with their own needs (Wendt, 1999: 358-9). In this respect, the norm of deterrence, the trust that is being built between the opponents, and the (mutual) constitution of their role identities may all lead to the creation of long term influences that preserve the practices of deterrence as well as the avoidance of violence. Since a basic level of trust is needed to attain ontological security, 21 the existence of it may further strengthen the practices of deterrence and the actors’ identities of deterrer and deterred actors.  In this respect, I argue that for the reasons mentioned earlier, the practices of deterrence should be understood as providing both physical and ontological security, thus refuting that there is necessarily tension between them. Exactly for this reason I argue that Rasmussen’s (2002: 331-2) assertion—according to which MAD was about enhancing ontological over physical security—is only partly correct. Certainly, MAD should be understood as providing ontological security; but it also allowed for physical security, since, compared to previous strategies and doctrines, it was all about decreasing the physical threat of nuclear weapons. Furthermore, the ability to increase one dimension of security helped to enhance the other, since it strengthened the actors’ identities and created more stable expectations of avoiding violence.

#### F-35 solves Koreans war

**Laird 13** – international defense consultant and co-founder of Second Line of Defense (Robbin, “China, Korea, & The F-35: Reshaping US Forces For A Pacific Strategy”, 2/1/13, http://defense.aol.com/2013/02/01/pacific-strategy-china-korea-f-35/)

The Defense of South Korea To illustrate what we could do to shape an effective strategy, I am going to look at two "cases": reworking [South Korean defense](http://defense.aol.com/2013/01/29/mike-wynne-former-air-force-secretary-says-us-should-deploy-fi/) and leveraging the F-35 global fleet as a strategic asset. We are in the throes of change in our relationships with our South Korean ally and the North Korean threat as well. By 2015, we are scheduled to [alter the command relationships in South Korea](http://defense.aol.com/2012/06/15/korean-right-campaigns-to-keep-joint-hq-with-us/) to put the South Koreans in a greater position to command their own forces and to shape the allied capability to deal with the North Korean threat. From the US side, this means that there is a strategic opportunity as well to re-shape South Korean and American forces to contribute more to regional defense and to redesign forces which are currently designed more for static Sitzkreig than for dynamic defense. The Japanese have captured the right concept: allies need to enhance their dynamic defense. And for the US, such developments provide the opportunity to link to the type of forces Gen. Robling discussed earlier. [In an exclusive interview with us](http://www.sldinfo.com/meeting-the-korean-defense-challenge-the-view-from-7th-air-force/), the Commander of the 7th US Air Force, [Lt. General Jan-Marc Jouas](http://www.af.mil/information/bios/bio.asp?bioID=7809), underscored the nature of the challenge and the possibilities for transition. "We need to be able to attack in depth. We also need to be able to attack at the forward edge of the battle space. We need to be operating against targets that will create not just tactical effects, but operational and strategic. We need to be operating cross domain, and by that I mean kinetic and non-kinetic effects, one reinforcing the other. "One of our greatest advantages is our air operation center that will oversee the entire air campaign, and where I will be situated as the air component commander. "And any deployment of F-35s to the Korean peninsula will clearly modify the template, including the Marine Corps F-35B. "The Seventh Air Force relationship with the Marine Corps is the best I've ever seen. Their aircraft will be dedicated to the Marine Air Ground Task Force (MAGTF) at some point, but before then, they will be used as part of our air campaign to the greatest effect that we can deliver. "The F-35A, B, and C will give us greater flexibility, and greater options in terms of where and how we can operate." This leads then to the potential strategic impact of joint deployments and developments of the F-35 throughout the region. The F-35 is a C2 (command-and-control) and IW (Information Warfare) aircraft. But it is when the US deploys [the F-35 in numbers](http://defense.aol.com/2013/01/10/why-the-air-force-needs-a-lot-of-f-35s-gen-hostage-on-the-com/) that we will see the strategic impact of a tactical aircraft. The discussion of the shift from 4th to 5th generation aircraft has often missed the point of what the impact of deploying a significant number of F-35s in a region as central as the Pacific could have on the U.S. and its allies. **The F-35 can play the role of a linchpin in a 21st century Pacific strategy which is centered on and enabled by our allies**. Indeed, the F-35 as a lynchpin to interactive allied and American capabilities intersect nicely with the overall strategy whereby the United States is the key lynchpin power in the allied coalitions of the Pacific. **The concepts of operations underlying a new approach to providing lynchpin capabilities are built around the F-35. Presence, scalability, and reachback are solid foundations for the kind of deterrence necessary in the evolving strategic environment in the Pacific**. The F-35 as an Allied and American fleet brings several key and core capabilities to shaping [a new attack/defense enterprise](http://defense.aol.com/2013/01/04/crafting-a-pacific-attack-and-defense-enterprise-the-strategic-qu/), one which allows the US to play a key lynchpin role and yet, at the same time puts allies in the lead to defend themselves and their own interests. A global fleet of F-35s in the Pacific provides several significant contributions to shaping a 21st century strategy: a networked fleet, significant interoperability, multiple and diversified basing, enabling a wolfpack operational approach to leverage best value out of deployed assets, and a globally sustained fleet. [I have developed these concepts elsewhere](http://www.sldinfo.com/the-f-35-and-pacific-strategy-shaping-a-core-lynchpin/), but will focus here simply on one key element: a globally sustained fleet. The entire approach of the F-35 enables the sustainment of the fleet in radically different ways from the past. And it is coming at a time when economic pressures create such a need; but if new approaches are not taken money will be invested in maintaining less effective forces. The F-35 global sustainment approach allows for a more effective and dynamic force at less cost than operating a legacy fleet. At the heart of the new model is an inherent capability to leverage logistics hubs throughout the Pacific to create a seamless system to sustain both allied and American planes. Presence from this perspective has a whole different meaning. Hub sustainment means that the US can surge aircraft to the region and have them be supported during surge operations withouthaving to haul its sustainment assets forward with the surged aircraft, which is the requirement currently. Building a training and sustainment infrastructure in the Pacific -- with hubs and ranges in Canada and Australia, and hubs in Japan, South Korea, Singapore, Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam -- provides an opportunity to re-shape how sustainment can be done in around the world. This will bring with it a significant boost to sortie rates and hence operational capabilities.

#### Korean crisis escalates to great power conflict

**Metz 3/13** Steven Metz 3-13, Chairman of the Regional Strategy and Planning Department and Research Professor of National Security Affairs at the Strategic Studies Institute, 3/13/13, “Strategic Horizons: Thinking the Unthinkable on a Second Korean War,” http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/12786/strategic-horizons-thinking-the-unthinkable-on-a-second-korean-war

Today, North Korea is **the most dangerous country on earth** and the greatest threat to U.S. security. For years, the bizarre regime in Pyongyang has issued an unending stream of claims that a U.S. and South Korean invasion is imminent, while declaring that it will defeat this offensive just as -- according to official propaganda -- it overcame the unprovoked American attack in 1950. Often the press releases from the official North Korean news agency are absurdly funny, and American policymakers tend to ignore them as a result. **Continuing to do so**, though, could be dangerous as events and rhetoric turn even more ominous. ¶ In response to North Korea's Feb. 12 nuclear test, the U.N. Security Council recently tightened existing sanctions against Pyongyang. Even China, North Korea's long-standing benefactor and protector, went along. Convulsed by anger, Pyongyang then threatened a pre-emptive nuclear strike against the United States and South Korea, abrogated the 1953 armistice that ended the Korean War and cut off the North-South hotline installed in 1971 to help avoid an escalation of tensions between the two neighbors. A spokesman for the North Korean Foreign Ministry asserted that a second Korean War is unavoidable. He might be right; for the first time, an official statement from the North Korean government may prove true. ¶ No American leader wants another war in Korea. The problem is that the North Koreans make so many threatening and bizarre official statements and sustain such a high level of military readiness that **American policymakers might fail to recognize the signs of impending attack**. After all, **every recent U.S. war began with miscalculation**; American policymakers misunderstood the intent of their opponents, who in turn underestimated American determination. The conflict with North Korea could repeat this pattern. ¶ Since the regime of Kim Jong Un has continued its predecessors’ tradition of responding hysterically to every action and statement it doesn't like, it's hard to assess exactly what might push Pyongyang over the edge and cause it to lash out. It could be something that the United States considers modest and reasonable, or it could be some sort of internal power struggle within the North Korean regime invisible to the outside world. While **we cannot know** whether the recent round of threats from Pyongyang is serious or simply more of the same old lathering, it would be prudent to **think the unthinkable** and reason through what a war instigated by a fearful and delusional North Korean regime might mean for U.S. security. ¶ The second Korean War could begin with missile strikes against South Korean, Japanese or U.S. targets, or with a combination of missile strikes and a major conventional invasion of the South -- something North Korea has prepared for many decades. **Early attacks might include nuclear weapons**, but even if they didn't, the United States would probably move quickly to destroy any existing North Korean nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles. ¶ The war itself would be extremely costly and probably long. North Korea is the most militarized society on earth. Its armed forces are backward but huge. It's hard to tell whether the North Korean people, having been fed a steady diet of propaganda based on adulation of the Kim regime, would resist U.S. and South Korean forces that entered the North or be thankful for relief from their brutally parasitic rulers. As the conflict in Iraq showed, the United States and its allies should prepare for widespread, protracted resistance even while hoping it doesn't occur. Extended guerrilla operations and insurgency could potentially last for years following the defeat of North Korea's conventional military. North Korea would need massive relief, as would South Korea and Japan if Pyongyang used nuclear weapons. Stabilizing North Korea and developing an effective and peaceful regime would require a lengthy occupation, whether U.S.-dominated or with the United States as a major contributor. ¶ The second Korean War would force military mobilization in the United States. This would initially involve the military's existing reserve component, but it would probably ultimately require a major expansion of the U.S. military and hence a draft. The military's training infrastructure and the defense industrial base would have to grow. This would be a body blow to efforts to cut government spending in the United States and postpone serious deficit reduction for some time, even if Washington increased taxes to help fund the war. Moreover, a second Korean conflict would **shock the global economy** and potentially **have destabilizing effects outside Northeast Asia**. ¶ Eventually, though, the United States and its allies would defeat the North Korean military. At that point it would be impossible for the United States to simply re-establish the status quo ante bellum as it did after the first Korean War. The Kim regime is too unpredictable, desperate and dangerous to tolerate. Hence regime change and a permanent ending to the threat from North Korea would have to be America's strategic objective. ¶ China would pose the most pressing and serious challenge to such a transformation of North Korea. After all, Beijing's intervention saved North Korean dictator Kim Il Sung after he invaded South Korea in the 1950s, and Chinese assistance has kept the subsequent members of the Kim family dictatorship in power. Since the second Korean War would invariably begin like the first one -- with North Korean aggression -- hopefully China has matured enough as a great power to allow the world to remove its dangerous allies this time. If the war began with out-of-the-blue North Korean missile strikes, China could conceivably even contribute to a multinational operation to remove the Kim regime. ¶ Still, China would vehemently oppose a long-term U.S. military presence in North Korea or a unified Korea allied with the United States. One way around this might be a grand bargain leaving a unified but neutral Korea. However appealing this might be, Korea might hesitate to adopt neutrality as it sits just across the Yalu River from a China that tends to claim all territory that it controlled at any point in its history. ¶ If the aftermath of the second Korean War is not handled adroitly, the result could easily be heightened hostility between the United States and China, perhaps even a new cold war. After all, history shows that deep economic connections do not automatically prevent nations from hostility and **war** -- in 1914 Germany was heavily involved in the Russian economy and had extensive trade and financial ties with France and Great Britain. It is not inconceivable then, that after the second Korean War, U.S.-China relations would be antagonistic and hostile at the same time that the two continued mutual trade and investment. Stranger things have happened in statecraft.

#### Plan solves stability, asia shift, and relations—

Rapiey ‘11 Stanley Joseph Rapiey, Department of Defense Civilian “Maquiladoras and National Security: Design Theory as a Guide.” 25, October, 2011

The Solution Frame takes into account the data gathered in the Environmental Frame, and deals with the issues raised in the Problem Frame in order to develop logical courses of action leading to the desired end state. Considering the history of the system, the goals and tendencies of the actors, and challenges in achieving the desired end state, a logical conclusion can be developed concerning the way forward. In order to mitigate the increasing instability that will arise as the maquiladoras lose their viability under global economic pressures, the United States and Mexico should take decisive preemptive measures. This paper recommends four courses of action in connection with the Mexican maquiladoras industry. These efforts target the root causes of the problem and focus on transforming the maquiladoras into a more effective industry. First of all, the United States government must encourage American companies to continue business with Mexican companies in the northern border states in order to guarantee economic stability and help the maquiladoras transform into more complex entities. The President should work with the Secretary of Commerce and the U.S. Trade Representative to develop a program by which U.S. companies are provided fiscal motivation to continue working with Mexican maquiladoras, instead of shifting their assembly operations to Asia. The incentives will most likely be in the form of tax benefits and should be tied to relationships with Mexican maquiladoras that meet strict criteria. Because this is connected to altering the tax code, Congress must pass related legislation. The two most important criteria for the maquiladoras associated with this program are that they pay a living wage to their local employees and that they are engaged in a program designed to increase the complexity of their production. These factories will be able to pay better wages because of the continued investment from U.S. companies who will receive the tax benefit, and these wages will help stabilize the local economy. The U.S. Department of Commerce can assist the Government of Mexico with concrete plans to improve the maquiladoras, in concert with current Mexican goals to revitalize its export industry through increased government financing.42 Because the Mexican Government has already come to the realization that the simple assembly model must evolve into something more technologically complex, these plans can quickly be organized.43 In order to effectively advocate this course of action, the focus should be placed on the stimulation of the U.S. economy through tax relief to American companies and the need to preserve a secure environment along the border.

#### Foreign investment is key to evolve factories technologically—

Rapiey ‘11 Stanley Joseph Rapiey, Department of Defense Civilian “Maquiladoras and National Security: Design Theory as a Guide.” 25, October, 2011

A third challenge associated with this system concerns the lack of complexity of the production performed by the maquiladoras. The vast majority of maquiladoras conduct simple assembly, so the factories involved are tooled for basic production, and the employees only have basic skills. This drastically limits the ability of both the factories and their employees to adjust to new forms of production as the maquiladoras fall to foreign competitors. This industry is so tightly tied to specific customers in the U.S. that a transition to some other form of production would require massive changes in structure and labor. The Mexican government understands this as a problem and seeks to drive the evolution of so-called “first generation” maquiladoras to second and third generation models. The first generation maquiladoras are the least complex and simply assemble raw materials. Foreign investment brings with it technology, and, with this technology, the maquiladoras evolve into more complex factories that eventually focus less on labor intensity and more on more sophisticated products, R&D and even product design.39 Unfortunately, there are few examples of this trend, and many critics complain that the entire concept of the maquiladora “traps developing countries into the deadend role of providing cheap labor for low value-added assembly operations.”40

#### Investment is critical—Key to solve border security, trafficking, and the economy

Rapiey ‘11 Stanley Joseph Rapiey, Department of Defense Civilian “Maquiladoras and National Security: Design Theory as a Guide.” 25, October, 2011 [MG]

The relevant policy drivers for the United States government are preserving stability along its border, curbing illegal immigration, maintaining a strong domestic economy, and building productive relationships with Mexico.20 It should be immediately noted that these goals can come into conflict with one another. For example, although maintaining a thriving economy entails ensuring that U.S. businesses have the opportunity to engage in deals that are the most lucrative, abandoning current relationships with Mexican factories could negatively affect relations between the two countries. Current initiatives to secure the Southern border and curb illegal immigration might also affect how the U.S. interacts with Mexico in the economic or anti-drug arenas. Mexico’s goals are extremely similar to those of the United States. Security and stability along its border, a strong domestic economy, and building strong relations with the U.S. are all high priorities for the Mexican government. Illegal immigration, although a contentious issue for the United States, is not bothersome for Mexico.21 Although nearly identical on the surface, the Mexican goals involve different priorities than those of the U.S. For example, a strong domestic economy for Mexico means a continuance of the large amount of remittances from Mexicans in the United States.22 It also concerns focusing its industry on the production of goods for domestic consumption and focusing on high-tech indigenous models.23 For Mexico, “building strong relations” with the United States involves the receipt of assistance, whereas for the U.S., such relations mean increased cooperation on terrorism and illegal immigration.24 The differences in tendencies and goals for the actors in this system will become the center of analysis during the Problem Frame.

#### The United States federal government should offer financial assistance toward the assembly-for-export industry in Mexico.

## 2ac

### 2ac – manufacturing

#### Interdependence prevents US-Russian war

**Simes 07 –** (Dimitri K. Simes, President of the Nixon Center and Publisher of The National Interest, "Losing War." Foreign Affairs." NOv/DEc. 2007. Lexis)

The good news is that although Russia is disillusioned with the United States and Europe, it is so far not eager to enter into an alliance against the West. **The Russian people do not want to risk their new prosperity**--and Russia's elites are loath to give up their Swiss bank accounts, London mansions, and Mediterranean vacations**. Although Russia is seeking greater military cooperation with China, Beijing does not seem eager to start a fight with Washington either.** At the moment, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization--which promotes cooperation among China, Russia, and the Central Asian states--is a debating club rather than a genuine security alliance.

#### Concedes heg is key to solve great power war

**Monteiro 11** \*Nuno P. Monteiro is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yale University [<http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/ISEC_a_00064>, “Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity is not Peaceful”]

In addition, Wohlforth claims that wars among major powers are unlikely, because the unipole will prevent conflict from erupting among important states. He writes, “The sole pole’s power advantages matter only to the degree that it is engaged, and it is most likely to be engaged in politics among the other major powers. 44 **I agree** that if the unipole were to pursue a strategy of defensive dominance, major power wars would be unlikely. Yet, there is no compelling reason to expect that it will always follow such a course. Should the unipole decide to disengage, as Wohlforth implies, **major power wars would be possible**

**Monteiro uses bad data**

**Busby 12**

Josh Busby, is an Assistant Professor at the LBJ School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas-Austin, The Duck of Minerva (don't worry - it's legit), January 3, 2012, "Get Real! Chicago IR guys out in force", http://duckofminerva.blogspot.com/2012/01/get-real-chicago-ir-guys-out-in-force.html

Monteiro's piece “Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful” basically takes issue with Bill Wohlforth's earlier work on unipolarity and tries to ask a slightly different question. Rather than assess whether unipolarity is stable, he tries to evaluate whether it is peaceful. And his answer is that unipolarity is not at all peaceful and much less peaceful than other periods and then seeks to explain why. Is Unipolarity Peaceful? As evidence, Monteiro provides metrics of the number of years during which great powers have been at war. For the unipolar era since the end of the Cold War, the United States has been at war 13 of those 22 years or 59% (see his Table 2 below). Now, I've been following some of the discussion by and about Steven Pinker and Joshua Goldstein's work that suggests the world is becoming more peaceful with interstate wars and intrastate wars becoming more rare. I was struck by the graphic that Pinker used in a Wall Street Journal piece back in September that drew on the Uppsala Conflict Data, which shows a steep decline in the number of deaths per 100,000 people. How do we square this account by Monteiro of a unipolar world that is not peaceful (with the U.S. at war during this period in Iraq twice, Afghanistan, Kosovo) and Pinker's account which suggests declining violence in the contemporary period? Where Pinker is focused on systemic outcomes, Monteiro's measure merely reflect years during which the great powers are at war. Under unipolarity, there is only one great power so the measure is partial and not systemic. However, Monteiro's theory aims to be systemic rather than partial. In critiquing Wohlforth's early work on unipolarity stability, Monteiro notes: Wohlforth’s argument does not exclude all kinds of war. Although power preponderance allows the unipole to manage conflicts globally, this argument is not meant to apply to relations between major and minor powers, or among the latter (17). So presumably, a more adequate test of the peacefulness or not of unipolarity (at least for Monteiro) is not the number of years the great power has been at war but whether the system as a whole is becoming more peaceful under unipolarity compared to previous eras, including wars between major and minor powers or wars between minor powers and whether the wars that do happen are as violent as the ones that came before. Now, as Ross Douthat pointed out, Pinker's argument isn't based on a logic of benign hegemony. It could be that even if the present era is more peaceful, unipolarity has nothing to do with it. Moreover, Pinker may be wrong. Maybe the world isn't all that peaceful. I keep thinking about the places I don't want to go to anymore because they are violent (Mexico, Honduras, El Salvador, Nigeria, Pakistan, etc.) As Tyler Cowen noted, the measure Pinker uses to suggest violence is a per capita one, which doesn't get at the absolute level of violence perpetrated in an era of a greater world population. But, if my read of other reports based on Uppsala data is right, war is becoming more rare and less deadly (though later data suggests lower level armed conflict may be increasing again since the mid-2000s). The apparent violence of the contemporary era may be something of a presentist bias and reflect our own lived experience and the ubiquity of news media. Even if the U.S. has been at war for the better part of unipolarity, the deadliness is declining, even compared with Vietnam, let alone World War II.

### 2ac – human rights counterplan

#### Mexico says no – They ignore the problem for economic and security reasons

Shear and Archibold, 5/04 – a White House correspondent for The New York Times. Previously, Shear wrote for the Washington Post as a metro reporter covering Virginia politics, the 2008 presidential election and, most recently, as White House correspondent. Mr. Shear received a B.A. degree from Claremont McKenna College and a M.A. degree in public policy from the John F. Kennedy School at Harvard University and Randal Archibold has been a reporter for The New York Times’s national desk since September 2005, based in the Los Angeles bureau.

([MICHAEL D. SHEAR](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/s/michael_d_shear/index.html) and [RANDAL C. ARCHIBOLD](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/a/randal_c_archibold/index.html), May 4, 2013, “In Latin America, U.S. Focus Shifts From Drug War to Economy”, The New York Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/05/world/americas/in-latin-america-us-shifts-focus-from-drug-war-to-economy.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0>)//GP

Last week, Mr. Obama returned to capitals in Latin America with a vastly different message. Relationships with countries racked by drug violence and organized crime should focus more on economic development and less on the endless battles against drug traffickers and organized crime capos that have left few clear victors. The countries, Mexico in particular, need to set their own course on security, with the United States playing more of a backing role. That approach runs the risk of being seen as kowtowing to governments more concerned about their public image than the underlying problems tarnishing it. Mexico, which is eager to play up its economic growth, has mounted an aggressive effort to play down its crime problems, going as far as to encourage the news media to avoid certain slang words in reports. “The problem will not just go away,” said Michael Shifter, president of the Inter-American Dialogue. “It needs to be tackled head-on, with a comprehensive strategy that includes but goes beyond stimulating economic growth and alleviating poverty. “Obama becomes vulnerable to the charge of downplaying the region’s overriding issue, and the chief obstacle to economic progress,” he added. “It is fine to change the narrative from security to economics as long as the reality on the ground reflects and fits with the new story line.” Administration officials insist that Mr. Obama remains clear eyed about the security challenges, but the new emphasis corresponds with a change in focus by the Mexican government. The new Mexican president, Enrique Peña Nieto, took office in December vowing to reduce the violence that exploded under the militarized approach to the drug war adopted by his predecessor, Felipe Calderón. That effort left about 60,000 Mexicans dead and appears not to have significantly damaged the drug-trafficking industry.

#### Certainty key – prevent loss of production and hit to national security

General Adams, 13 – Brigadier General for the U.S. Army (Retired) (John, “REMAKING AMERICAN SECURITY: SUPPLY CHAIN VULNERABILITIES & NATIONAL SECURITY RISKS ACROSS THE U.S. DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE” http://americanmanufacturing.org/files/RemakingAmericanSecurityMay2013.pdf)djm

Accordingly, this report examined a series of defense industrial base sectors that are vital to U.S. security. Some are especially important and require immediate attention to prevent critical loss of supply or production capacity, constituting an immediate threat to national security. Some sectors are vulnerable to immediate disruption arising from excessive or misaligned foreign dependency, while others face longer-term challenges. In general, the risks posed to many sectors of the defense industrial base may prove very difficult to fix, because they are a part of powerful, prevailing trends in the international technology market and the global economy. All of these challenges demand our best strategic thinking about how to prevent or contain significant and potentially dangerous risks to national security. This report investigates those risks and is a call to action to mitigate them.

#### Mexico is key to the navy – copper nickel tubing

General Adams, 13 – Brigadier General for the U.S. Army (Retired) (John, “REMAKING AMERICAN SECURITY: SUPPLY CHAIN VULNERABILITIES & NATIONAL SECURITY RISKS ACROSS THE U.S. DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE” http://americanmanufacturing.org/files/RemakingAmericanSecurityMay2013.pdf)

In addition to these domestic companies, the European conglomerate KME and several companies in Mexico also produce Cu-Ni tubing for the U.S. Navy. However, other than Ansonia Brass & Copper, KME is the only company capable of producing this larger diameter tubing according to U.S. military specifications. As a result, the U.S. domestic production capability of Cu-Ni tubing is at risk, potentially leaving the U.S. Navy solely dependent on foreign manufacturers for this important supply chain.

#### More naval ships solve missile interception and delivery

\*improves c3I operations

**AFCEA 11–** Unclassified report released by The Armed Forces Communications and Electronics Association that serves the US military (“Information Dominance Industry Day Questions and Answers”, 4/5/11, Available Online @ http://www.afcea.org/mission/intel/documents/MasterAnswerDocument05APR11.pdf)//MM

C3I provides the backbone of command and control (C2) in all warfare areas, including BMD. The BMD mission is inherently Information Dominance-centric, and can be divided between “Left of Launch” and “Right of Launch.” In “Left of Launch”, effective cyber warfare and penetrating knowledge of the adversary are critical to shaping the battlespace. “Right of Launch” is focused on network support to the warfighter. Navy BMD C3I enables C2 to make rapid decisions inside the adversary’s decision cycle. The Navy is currently leveraging a proven and fully functioning BMD C3I architecture. Navy ships with BMD capability and key Fleet Command and Control nodes are part of the BMD system. This includes mission planning systems, sensors, fire control, and command and control centers from the tactical edge connected to the National level. In BMD, the Navy closely works with the Missile Defense Agency (MDA), STRATCOM, and other services on C3I matters to ensure effective BMD is delivered from BMD-capable ships and the future Aegis Ashore, via the Regional and Fleet Commanders, to BMDS at the National level. While we have a working structure, we clearly see growing adversary threats which necessitate better performance and capacity on the part of our networks. **More ships are needed** to intercept more ballistic missiles in a complex tactical/operational environment. To this end, we are improving network capabilities and access through the addition of Advanced Time Division Multiple Access Interface Processor (ATIP) and improved integration of Maritime Operations Centers (MOCs) with Joint Tactical Terminal (JTT) and Navy Multiband Terminal. We are improving BMD Mission Planning across the theater by integrating Aegis Mission Planner, MIPS-Maritime IAMD Planning System, and C2BMC. Starting in FY12 we have proposed adding 15 TF-IAMD Navy personnel with BMD expertise in each MOC.

**That’s key to solve Chinese ASBM threats**

**AFCEA 11–** Unclassified report released by The Armed Forces Communications and Electronics Association that serves the US military (“Information Dominance Industry Day Questions and Answers”, 4/5/11, Available Online @ http://www.afcea.org/mission/intel/documents/MasterAnswerDocument05APR11.pdf)//MM

Adversary ballistic missiles threaten our allies worldwide and our homeland- Hawaii, Alaska, Guam, and CONUS itself. Chinese development of so-called ‘carrier killer’ ASBMs compounds the Navy BMD challenge as our afloat forces become targets of exoatmospheric ballistic missiles in addition to the variety of cruise missiles and other threats we face. The Navy must integrate BMD into an effective, broader Integrated Air and Missile (IAMD) capability. The Navy Air and Missile Defense Command (NAMDC) at Dahlgren has the task to promote rapid delivery of new IAMD technologies; support development and validation of IAMD requirements for Joint and Navy processes; lead Navy IAMS concept, doctrine, and tactics development, and experimentation; and, advocate Navy positions and capabilities in Joint forums. We are closely aligned with NAMDC through the BMD roadmap as a part of the Navy Ballistic Missile Defense Enterprise. These alignments provide us the opportunities to play vital roles in IAMD, bringing important capabilities from across N2/N6. These include, on the right side of the kill chain, **improved C3I and network integration and operational coordination**. On the left side of the kill chain, this means development of constant and penetrating knowledge of the adversary and cyber skills to provide persistent access to adversary networks. Across the full kill chain, it means supporting the ability to synchronize kinetic and non-kinetic responses to give our afloat forces the confidence to operate effectively in the face of a full range of threats.

**China uses ASBM’s – causes escalation**

**Chimerica 11 –** (“Attack by an ASBM”, 2011, Chimerica War, Online @ <http://www.chimericawar.org/carrier_killer.html>)

Although it is entirely credible that China would unexpectedly strike a carrier without any warning or notable increase in regional tension this would actually be very out of character for the PLA China has a predictable history of giving many warnings before striking an opponent. Of course, this doesn’t discount commanders being so blinkered to the signs, like McCarthur and blundering on regardless, but characteristically, China can usually be counted on to give clear warning signs of an attack. In the modern age, it is more than likely that tensions would have significantly risen or actual conflict taking place before the ASBM is considered as a strike option. James Kraska’s story of a single, untraceable ASBM sinking the USS George Washington out of the blue is unrealistic and the global atmosphere is more likely to resemble Harper’s piece on Chinese Missiles and the Walmart Factor. As offensive operations rarely take place in isolation, we can confidently surmise that the US and China will have already gone through a significant ratcheting up of tensions, both economically and militarily, and any decision to hit a carrier will not be made in a bubble. Therefore, on the verge of war, the PLA will be doing everything it can to find carrier battle groups while the battle groups will be doing everything they can to slip into favorable positions un-noticed. It should be noted here that the concept of an ASBM first came about from a study where they claimed the over-the-horizon radar could differentiate between different ships by comparing, over time, the frequent air activity around the carrier. Due to this, in a heightened war-situation we can reasonably assume that the carrier will not be flying multitudes of planes if it’s moving into a potential battle position and forward air cover could easily come from fighters flying from any number of global bases and using air-refueling. The carrier will be in a high alert, probably moving at a good pace to out run subs and in complete communication silence. There are any number of war scenarios existing on what the carrier would be doing, but let’s say, for the sake of this narrative, that the carrier is moving at 28knots with only a small escort, including some Aegis, and aiming to join up with a larger group to move forward as an overwhelming battle fleet into a hot zone off China’s coast. To any over-the-horizon radar a silent, cruising carrier would be almost undistinguishable from other ships, so the PLA would need multiple positive IDs to launch an attack. On top of this, any number of carrier battle groups could be coming from a multitude of directions. The Pacific Ocean is purportedly 166million square kilometers. The Indian Ocean is 44million square kilometers. The South China Sea alone is over 3.5million square kilometers. So the analogy of, “looking for a needle in a haystack,” doesn’t even do it justice. Carriers maybe big, but on the scale of things they are infinitesimally small in a huge mass of monotone sea. Let’s say for arguments sake that the PLA detection systems and more importantly the guys working them are totally on the money and manage to nail down a battle group to a certain area. The overhead satellites are then able to pick out ships moving in a specific direction. The satellites then need to keep a track on the ships movement in real time. Not as easy as it sounds. Don’t forget, GPS works by a device actively calling out to the satellites to find it. This will not happen in a war situation, it will be a completely passive search. It will be up to the controllers, probably based somewhere deep in China’s interior, to manually control the satellites guidance system to first locate, then precisely follow and plot the battle group's direction. Let’s say that the modern Chinese satellites can lock onto the carrier and follow it automatically once it is located. This still isn’t good enough to target though. The next step is to get an over-the-horizon radar signal and preferably drones on target. At this point it is just not credible to assume that the PLA would target a carrier based on just satellite co-ordinates alone, even if numerous satellites were triangulating it. They will need some other kind of terminal guidance system to help the missiles hit the target. The margin of error on a fast moving, possibly erratic target would be too great, even for a suite of missiles. Bear in mind, conventional DF-21s missiles carrying only a 1000lb warhead and traveling at Mach 10 are going to need to hit, otherwise they’ll just make a very, very fast splash into the sea. (see here for some perspective) It would certainly put the fear of God into the sailors who saw it, but it wouldn’t stop the ships. On top of this, carriers are designed to get hit, or have planes crash into them so are incredibly durable and tough. Even a direct hit by a DF-21 with it's huge wave of kinetic energy is not guaranteed to terminally incapacitate a carrier. It would probably need multiple direct hits, then followed by sustained submarine attacks to sink it. The analogy comes to mind of getting a hand-full of glass marbles and trying to throw them into a plastic cup from a few feet away. Chances are you might get one or two in the cup if you're really good, but it's not guaranteed, and the ones that miss just don't count at all. Firing a missile from 2000km away and getting it witih 20-30metres is a fantastic shot - but it just doesn't count. It has to be a bull everytime. Let’s assume that things are going great for the PLA and it is able to get a confirmed “eyeball” sighting by a paramilitary fishing boat of the carrier. So the satellite data can now be corroborated with a first hand account that it is definitely a US carrier in the area that they're concentrating on. This of course assumes that the US Navy wouldn’t be neutralizing or jamming any boats in the vicinity, but let’s say the information gets through to the 2nd Artillery. On top of this, another lucky break happens, a PLA sub sights the carrier and also gives a confirmed sighting, but does not engage because the carrier is going too fast. The carrier could be zipping along at 30knots, with the max speed of the Jin around 20knots, if it wasn’t already cued for an attack it could only watch as it rushed by. A message is sent to other Chinese subs to rendezvous at a certain point along the carriers proposed course and lie in wait. The subs will be used in a second tier attack on the carrier after it has received a volley from the DF-21s. With two confirmed sightings and a satellite track the PLA controllers are confident that they are zeroing in on a carrier kill and send word to the Central Military Commission, 套机构两块牌子(CMC) The CMC is already in session in its war room and begins to seriously consider making a strike on the battle group given the positive identification and reliable satelite track. Word is now sent to the countless mobile DF-21s launchers across the country to get ready for a launch. Mathematicians and strategists in the PLA begin to try and predict the carrier’s route and decide upon the best place to try and launch a strike and cue up the subs for the definitive kill. Other attack platforms are readied to complement the attack once it is underway. UAVs are launched from Chinese ships and the mainland to directly locate the carrier. As the US ships draw closer, Chinese over-the-horizon radars begin to try and distinguish the carrier from the escorts. Meanwhile, off the coast of China, the multiple over-the-horizon radars light up like bonfires for the numerous US subs that are lying quietly in position, cued to strike on command at Chinese ground targets and subs. The carrier is not blindly, blundering into a Chinese trap but is part of a larger, counter trap being set by the US submarine fleet. The CMC, gets on to the Emergency Hotline to Washington and warns them that, “they can not be held responsible if any US warships enter Chinese Territorial Waters”. For Washington, this is “game-on”. They were expecting the CCP to give a final warning and they characteristically do, right on cue. All US ships in the region are put on alert that a missile attack is imminent and aimed at the incoming carrier battle groups. Minutes drain by like hours. The carrier group moves forward and despite the US Air Force shooting down a number of PLAAF stealth, UAVs, two of them slip through the net and lock onto the carrier. The carrier is now painted with exact, real-time coordinates streaming from two undetected UAVs, the over-the-horizon radar and satellite tracking. This is enough data to complete the ASBM terminal guidance system. The 2nd Artillery quickly informs the CMC that they have all the data they need to launch an attack on the incoming battle group. Time is of the essence now. The carrier needs to be neutralized before it can get in range of the Chinese mainland with its F-18s. An effective battle group can punch 600 attacks on target in just one day and repeat that for days if not weeks. It is essential that if the strike takes place it happens as soon a possible while the carrier is still far out to sea. The 2nd Artillery commanders urge their superiors that they have been incredibly lucky to have quickly amassed such reliable data and the time is now to strike hard, so as to knock the Americans onto their back foot. With a carrier sunk, or at least incapacitated, this will forestall any greater push by the Allied forces and could possibly weaken the 'fickle' US public’s will to fight. This is enough for the CMC and they order the strike. After receiving the orders, the 2nd Artillery begins to transmit the target data to the 100 DF-21s that will launch. Note: this is not a static target with fixed coordinates that they’re aiming to hit. So, the data can’t be finalized. The DF-21s will be launched into the air without the final co-ordinates in their guidance system. This will have to come later, while it’s flying at Mach 10. Which is not to be underestimated as an incredibly difficult thing to do. Fortunately, Chinese scientists have already cracked this incredibly difficult task. The 2nd Artillery’s C4ISR are confident that they can transmit to the terminal guidance system on board the warhead at the critical time using the over-the-horizon radar data, UAVs and their new, advanced satellite communications streaming. The DF-21 will launch into one orbit, then change direction and zero in on the carrier. The speed at which this is done will out maneuver the Aegis and Patriot tracking systems, that traditionally rely on predictable trajectories of missiles to intercept. The DF-21s begin to fire-up. Meanwhile, the eyes and ears of the US military are scouring China for signs of a missile launches. Just like in Iraq they have a window of detection as the missiles are readied for firing. Only this time, the US can’t strike them as they prepare, as they’re on the Chinese Mainland in protected airspace and this would be crossing a significant ‘red-line’ at this stage in the conflict. However, as soon as the birds are airborne, all bets will be off. As the mobile launchers prepare to launch all US subs in the region, including a suite of Ohio class (SSBNs) nuclear warhead carrying subs are put on high alert for imminent launch. As the Chinese missiles begin to fire up squadrons of B-52s and B1s take off from Guam, Diego Garcia and Barksdale packing conventional and nuclear weapons. Within minutes the US has hundreds of bombers in the sky. Nuclear Silos across the US go to high alert for imminent launch. Russian listening posts pick up the Chinese actions and also all the US activity and engage in similar counter measures, readying its army for a possible nuclear exchange. The minutes now quickly drain down and all the 21s are ready to fly. Final word goes out to the 2nd Artillery commander who relays this to the CMC one last time. Convinced that sinking a carrier will put the US on the back foot they decisively give the go ahead, and 50 of the 100 missiles are sent skyward. STOP… Take a second to contemplate the gravity of this scenario… At this exact moment China has launched 50, unknown sub-orbital ballistic missiles into the air. The type and destination are unknown. It could be part of an ASBM package, or it could be a preemptive nuclear strike on an unspecified country? The US, Russia, India, UK and France would all go to DEFCON One and could all release an instant nuclear counter strike on China. The world has evolved to avoid using ballistic missiles as the preferred weapon of choice in war as they could easily provoke a full blown nuclear exchange. This is why the ASBM system is so out of whack with current weapon systems. It can not be differentiated from a preemptive nuclear strike. The US is now faced with two choices, are these airborne missiles conventional or nuclear? If they believe they are nuclear then China will be on the receiving end of an unprecedented nuclear retaliatory strike by the The Allies and possibly Russia, even India. The US may also assume that these missiles are part of an ASBM package but may still be nuclear, so again it would launch nuclear weapons to counter. The US has almost no way of knowing what kind of missiles have just been launched from the mobile carriers. So much for **the ASBM** keeping the US at arms length. Instead it **has the potential to cause a nuclear exchange.** The only way China could guarantee that it wouldn’t receive a nuclear counter-strike from launching so many DF-21s into the sky is if they pre-arranged some signal to inform the US, Russia, India, France and Britain that they were only using conventional weapons. Such a system would be inherently flawed because why would anyone believe them, and if it did work it would be giving away too much intelligence. “Oh, hi, yeah, so this is Xi Xinping, yeah, um, you know those missiles we just launched well they’re conventional, not nuclear ok, so can you make your response appropriate?” A funny joke, but really, how else would you suggest China, a nuclear armed country, convince the other nuclear nations of the world that the launching of multiple, sub-orbital ballistic missiles is not a nuclear preemptive strike but is only aimed at ships? This not so very small point aside, let’s assume for the sake of the story, that the US doesn’t carry out a massive retaliatory, nuclear strike but is confident that it's only a bunch of conventional DF-21s flying at Mach 10 aimed at its carrier battle groups. Only? As soon as the birds are airborne, US subs and possibly stealth bombers off the coast will begin targeting the Chinese over-the-horizon radars, which will have two choices, keep transmitting data or risk getting hit. If they power down and relocate quickly, they may live, but the DF-21s will be left flying blind. As China has launched missiles from the mainland at the US Navy, it will no longer be considered a naval battle and the numerous subs and stealth bombers will begin attacking relevant C4ISR on the Chinese mainland. With a billion dollar carrier at stake and the lives of thousands of Americans it’s a “no brainer” now and a race against time as the US tries to take out critical Chinese infrastructure on the coast. The DF-21s, which will probably be launched from further inland will take around 12minutes to reach their target as they will first need to leave the atmosphere, and then come back down at Mach 10. Plus their target is a 1000kms out. The question will be, can the US cruise missiles take out enough critical assets to break the delicate information chain needed to bring the DF-21s down on target? Remember, only a bull counts. Near misses count for nothing, no matter how close. In unison to this missile exchange, military assets right across the Pacific Rim will go on to a maximum war footing. Militaries in Japan, Korea, Australia, Philippines, Malaysia, Brunei, Indonesia, India, Vietnam and Russia will go to their highest alerts. More than likely, there will be air-combat in the areas around Japan as twitchy pilots from US and the JMSDF engage the PLAAF in dog fights. Across Japan, Patriot batteries stir into life and a string of 35 Aegis Cruisers from the US, Japan, Korea, and Australia brace for missile intercepts. Japan would assume that any number of these missiles could be aimed at her and would immediately begin to mobilize a counter attack.

#### Robust naval power key to US-Indian relations

Cropsey 06, senior fellow at the Hudson Institute, deputy undersecretary of the Navy in the Reagan and George H.W. Bush administrations, (Seth, Dec, “The Global Trident”, Armed Forces Journal, <http://www.armedforcesjournal.com/2006/12/2307414>)

The geographic pivot of the Muslim littoral is democratic India — with its minority population of 140 million Muslims. Their participation in an increasingly prosperous and successful democratic state would be persuasive far beyond the subcontinent in establishing the compatibility of Islam with democracy. A key element of U.S. maritime strategy’s focus on the Muslim littoral should be to draw India closer to the U.S. through increased military-to-military exercises, ship visits and cooperation with Indian authorities in civil assistance.India is equally important in assuring the success of democracy in Asia. India’s long-standing enmity toward China represents a physical point of intersection between the maritime strategy’s focus on the western Pacific and its role in preventing the further spread of radical Islam. The two prongs of this strategy are complemented by the third, the U.S.’s unchanging requirement to demonstrate its willingness and capability to remain a global superpower. The most convincing demonstration of American will and reach is a navy large, powerful and flexible enough to apply effective force where U.S. interests are endangered.

### 2ac – politics

#### No STEM shortage

Hickey 13

[Walter, B.S. Applied Mathematics (William and Mary), Politics and Markets Reporter

Business Insider, “A Brand New Report Shows Just How Wrong Silicon Valley Is About A Tech Worker Shortage,” Business Insider, 5/31, <http://www.businessinsider.com/a-brand-new-report-shows-just-how-wrong-silicon-valleys-claim-of-a-stem-shortage-is-2013-5#ixzz2Wcm0nFLe>]

A new report from the esteemed Georgetown Center on Education and the Workforce presents a pretty significant rebuttal to that claim. ¶ Released on Wednesday, the annual report looks at how new college graduates are faring in the recession-era economy. ¶ That it's titled "Hard Times" should give you a decent idea on how millennials are doing. ¶ Most interesting is the technology sector numbers. Were there truly a STEM shortage — were demand for STEM majors to exceed supply — one would expect that unemployment statistics for recent STEM graduates would be outstandingly low. ¶ The reality? Nope. From the report:¶ Unemployment seems mostly concentrated in information systems (14.7 %) compared with computer science (8.7%) and mathematics (5.9%). As noted in an earlier report, hiring tends to be slower for users of information compared to those who write programs and create software applications.¶ Let's get a little perspective here. According to the report, new information science graduates have worse unemployment than sociology (9.9%), archaeology (12.6%) and English (9.8%) majors. ¶ Hard Times¶ What gives?¶ If there's a STEM shortage, why are one in every eleven recent computer science graduates out of a job? Why are one in every seven information science majors out of work if Silicon Valley is so desperate to import talent?¶ The reality is that from an economic perspective we don't have a STEM shortage.¶ What we may have is a "STEM majors who have the skills that Silicon Valley prefers" shortage.¶ But to say we have a STEM shortage is needlessly hyperbolic

#### CIR is DOA – Shutdown Drained His PC and Increased Congressional Partisanship

By Amie Parnes 10/18/13 05:30 AM ET Obama’s hollow debt victory http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/329219-obamas-hollow-debt-victory#ixzz2i5oBnwAU

President Obama’s victory over congressional Republicans is likely to have a short shelf life.¶ Even the president’s staunchest allies are skeptical that his triumph in the debt-ceiling battle has produced much capital for the White House to spend on priorities like immigration reform. ¶ “I don’t know that this changes anything,” one former senior administration official said. “I don’t think the president has new mojo from this.”¶ “What did they really do? They brought the country to the same place where we were a few weeks ago,” the former official said. “This isn’t like he passed healthcare. He ended a government shutdown and raised the debt limit. Those are routine items. It’s not like he campaigned on it.”¶ Obama took his second victory lap in two days Thursday on the heels of the bipartisan deal, chiding congressional Republicans for engaging in political brinksmanship with the economy on the day the government reopened after a 16-day shutdown.¶ He also blamed the GOP — as he has in recent days — for bringing the nation dangerously close to defaulting on the debt limit. ¶ “You don’t like a particular policy or a particular president, then argue for your position,” Obama said in the State Dining Room at the White House. “Go out there and win an election.”¶ “Push to change it,” the president said. “But don’t break it.”¶ While he rallied White House allies with the sentiment, he also angered Republicans, who felt it was a sucker punch.**¶** “The president’s admonishment ignores his own shortcomings,” said one senior Republican adviser working on Capitol Hill. “The fact is, he shares equal blame for the shutdown. It’s not as if the stalemate was created overnight. The shutdown is fallout from Obama’s lack of outreach and his ineffective approach to being a leader.”¶ The GOP adviser — who acknowledged defeat in the fight — said Obama’s admonition was “entirely void of the substance of the debate and designed to demonize legitimate opposition.¶ “[It] totally ignored was the president’s own past opposition to raising the debt ceiling and the months leading to this episode when the White House could have been working with Congress to avoid such a crisis,” the adviser said.¶ Republican strategist Ron Bonjean said he didn’t expect relations between Obama and Republicans to improve.¶ “No one has political capital at this point to really accomplish major legislative initiatives by the end of this year,” Bonjean said. “It’s highly unlikely that any comprehensive immigration reform bill would be able to move through the House after such a bruising fight over the shutdown and the debt ceiling.”

#### The money for the plan would be taken covertly

Michael E. Salla, PhD Center for Global Peace/School of International Service American University, Washington DC 11/23/2003[ The black budget report, http://www.slideshare.net/ProphecyFactory/the-blackbudgetreport-9017285]

Birth of the Black Budget In 1947, the National Security Act created the National Security Council, the Central Intelligence Organization (CIA) and consolidated the US military into one entity, the Department of Defense (DoD). One of the issues that remained unresolved from the creation and operation of the CIA was the extent to which its budget and intelligence activities would remain a secret. According to Article 1, sec. 9, of the US Constitution, “No money shall be drawn from the treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.” This constitutional requirement conflicted with the need for secrecy concerning Congressional appropriations for the CIA. The solution was for Congress to pass legislation approving the secrecy over the funding mechanisms used for the CIA and its intelligence related activities. The necessary bill was passed with great haste and minimal debate causing considerable concern among those few Congressmen brave enough to openly challenge the constitutionality of the Act. [3] Congressman Emmanuel Celler of New York voted for the bill but protested: “If the members of the Armed Services Committee can hear the detailed information to support this bill, why cannot the entire membership? Are they the Brahmins and we the untouchables? Secrecy is the answer.” [4] Celler, like the majority of Congressmen, passed the CIA Act very much like the wealthy father viewed the birth of an illegitimate child, appropriate care would be taken to provide for the child, but there would be no official admission of patrimony and the responsibility that entails. The 1949 CIA Act comprised additions to those sections of the 1947 National Security Act that dealt with the creation of CIA. The 1949 CIA Act gave a Congressional stamp of approval to the creation of a ‘black budget’ as the following sections make clear: … any other Government agency is authorized to transfer to or receive from the Agency such sums without regard to any provisions of law limiting or prohibiting transfers between appropriations [emphasis added]. Sums transferred to the Agency in accordance with this paragraph may be expended for the purposes and under the authority of sections 403a to 403s of this title without regard to limitations of appropriations from which transferred. [5] This section meant that funds could be transferred from the appropriations of other government departments earmarked for specific tasks, “without regard to any provisions of law”. For example, a Congressional appropriation earmarked for housing subsidies to low-income workers by Housing and Urban Development (HUD), could be legally transferred either to the CIA for covert intelligence activities or through the CIA to a DoD associated intelligence agency for a classified program. Thus HUD employees might find that their relevant housing programs were lacking the necessary funds for relief efforts even though Congress had appropriated these funds for this purpose. Any HUD official unfortunate enough as to enquire into the location of the missing funds would be deterred from pursuing the issue, and if these officials persisted, they could be summarily dismissed, and then exposed to a variety of CIA activities to silence them. [6] Despite its legal authority to transfer funds from other federal agencies regardless of what their Congressional appropriations were for, the conventional wisdom was that the major source of appropriations for the CIA came through the DoD. This is apparently what President Truman had in mind when he approved that the "operating funds for the organization [CIA] would be obtained from the Departments of State, War, and Navy instead of directly from Congress." [7] This funding arrangement ostensibly assured that the CIA would be subordinate to the Secretaries of Defense and State who would be in a better position to influence its covert activities. Four years after passage of the 1949 CIA Act, the following categories and sums in the relevant defense force appropriations apparently provided the bulk of the black budget funding of the CIA.

#### Budget is the top priority and CIR doesn’t pass

Jalonick, 10-17 – writer for Associated Press (Mary, 10-17, “Obama: Focus on Budget, Immigration, Farm Bill” http://www.kristv.com/news/obama-focus-on-budget-immigration-farm-bill/)djm

WASHINGTON (AP) - The government shutdown behind him, President Barack Obama focused Thursday on a new, trimmed down agenda by challenging Congress to overcome bitter partisan division and pass a budget and a farm bill and overhaul immigration. The president said getting through those three priorities would help Washington move beyond "the cloud of crisis" created by the 16-day partial shuttering of government operations. But he acknowledge the political reality that even passing such a slimmed-down agenda by the end of the year will be tough. "To all my friends in Congress, understand that how business is done in this town has to change because we've all got a lot of work to do on behalf of the American people, and that includes the hard work of regaining their trust," Obama said from the White House, the morning after signing a painfully forged bipartisan deal to reopen the government and avert a default. Obama has slashed his wish list from earlier this year, when he called for legislation to address climate change, an increase in the minimum wage, gun control and the closure of the Guantanamo Bay prison. The reduced priorities underscore how difficult it has been to get legislation through Congress, the short legislative calendar left this year and Obama's limited political capital. Prospects for passage of an immigration bill appear particularly dim. A bill passed by the Democratic-controlled Senate and backed by the White House includes billions for border security and a path to citizenship for those already living in the U.S. illegally, but most House Republicans have rejected the approach. Likewise, the roughly $500 billion farm bill has been held up over a dispute between the two chambers, this time over food stamps. The House has endorsed up to $4 billion in annual cuts to the almost $80 billion-a-year Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, while the Senate farm bill would cut only $400 million a year. The White House has threatened to veto the House bill. Obama did not mention the rift over food stamps but said the House should accept the Senate version of the bill. "Let's negotiate. What are we waiting for? Let's get this done," Obama said. The president said the first focus should be on reaching a budget agreement that lowers deficits, invests in education and infrastructure, cuts spending and closes corporate loopholes. Congressional negotiators were starting to discuss that issue Thursday.

### 2ac – neolib

#### The Role of the Ballot is Policy Simulation

Hodson 10 Derek, professor of education – Ontario Institute for Studies @ University of Toronto, “Science Education as a Call to Action,” Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, Vol. 10, Issue 3, p. 197-206

\*\*note: SSI = socioscientific issues

The final (fourth) level of sophistication in this issues-based approach is concerned with students findings ways of putting their values and convictions into action, helping them to prepare for and engage in responsible action, and assisting them in **developing the skills**, attitudes, and values **that will enable them to** take control of their lives, **cooperate with others to bring about change**, and work toward a more just and sustainable world in which power, wealth, and resources are more equitably shared. Socially and environmentally responsible behavior will not necessarily follow from knowledge of key concepts and possession of the “right attitudes.” As Curtin (1991) reminded us, it is important to distinguish between caring about and caring for. It is almost always much easier to proclaim that one cares about an issue than to do something about it. Put simply, our values are worth nothing until we live them. Rhetoric and espoused values will not bring about social justice and will not save the planet. We must change our actions. A politicized ethic of care (caring for) entails active involvement in a local manifestation of a particular problem or issue, exploration of the complex sociopolitical contexts in which the problem/issue is located, and attempts to resolve conflicts of interest. FROM STSE RHETORIC TO SOCIOPOLITICAL ACTION Writing from the perspective of environmental education, Jensen (2002) categorized the **knowledge** that is **likely to promote sociopolitical action** and encourage pro-environmental behavior into four dimensions: (a) **scientific and technological knowledge** that informs the issue or problem; (b) knowledge about the underlying social, political, and economic issues, conditions, and structures and how they contribute to creating social and environmental problems; (c) knowledge about how to bring about changes in society through direct or indirect action; and (d) knowledge about the likely outcome or direction of possible actions and the **desirability of those outcomes.** Although formulated as a model for environmental education, it is reasonable to suppose that Jensen's arguments are applicable to all forms of SSI-oriented action. Little needs to be said about dimensions 1 and 2 in Jensen's framework beyond the discussion earlier in the article. With regard to dimension 3, students need knowledge of actions that are likely to have positive impact and knowledge of how to engage in them. **It is essential** that they gain robust knowledge of the social, legal, and **political system(s)** that prevail in the communities in which they live and develop a clear understanding of how **decisions** are **made within** local, regional, and **national government** and within industry, commerce, and the military. Without knowledge of where and with whom power of decision making is located and awareness of the **mechanisms by which decisions are reached**, **intervention is not possible.** Thus, the curriculum I propose requires a concurrent program designed to achieve a measure of political literacy, including knowledge of how to engage in collective action with individuals who have different competencies, backgrounds, and attitudes but share a common interest in a particular SSI. Dimension 3 also includes knowledge of likely sympathizers and potential allies and strategies for encouraging cooperative action and group interventions. What Jensen did not mention but would seem to be a part of dimension 3 knowledge is the nature of science-oriented knowledge that would enable students to appraise the statements, reports, and arguments of scientists, politicians, and journalists and to present their own supporting or opposing arguments in a coherent, robust, and convincing way (s

ee Hodson [2009b] for a lengthy discussion of this aspect of science education). Jensen's fourth category includes awareness of how (and why) others have sought to bring about change and entails formulation of a vision of the kind of world in which we (and our families and communities) wish to live. It is important for students to explore and develop their ideas, dreams, and aspirations for themselves, their neighbors and families and for the wider communities at local, regional, national, and global levels—a clear overlap with futures studies/education. An essential step in cultivating the critical scientific and technological literacy on which **sociopolitical action depends** is the application of a social and political critique capable of challenging the notion of technological determinism. We can control technology and its environmental and social impact. More significantly, we can control the controllers and redirect technology in such a way that adverse environmental impact is substantially reduced (if not entirely eliminated) and issues of freedom, equality, and justice are kept in the forefront of discussion during the **establishment of policy**.

#### The affirmative solves – a focus on technology and creating activism for said technology is necessary

**Karlsson 12** – (Nov. 2012, Rasmus, PhD, lecturer at Hankuk University of Foreign Studies in Seoul, South Korea, “Individual Guilt or Collective Progressive Action? Challenging the Strategic Potential of Environmental Citizenship Theory,” Environmental Values 21 (2012): 459–474, ingenta)

In terms of its performative content, environmental citizenship theory tends to overlook the fundamental difference between individual and collective action. While an individual can presumably stop doing a particular activity (like driving), it nearly always takes a collective effort to **provide a meaningful alternative** (like public transportation). This difference seems to be especially pronounced when considering more radical strategies for sustainability like the difference between the individual action of not eating meat (because of its environmental impact) and the collective action of launching a new ‘Manhattan-project’ to develop artificial meat (Edelman et al. 2005) as a humane, safe and environmentally beneficial alternative to traditional meat production (Datar and Betti 2010). Thinking further about this difference, one could argue that environmental citizenship theory provides a deceptively simple answer to a complex question when it holds that justice primarily requires us to reduce our own individual ecological footprint. This line of criticism becomes especially powerful if we have reason to believe that there are indeed accelerating technological paths to sustainability on a global level but that these paths are dependent on **radical political action** and a serious commitment to investment in the present (Mandle 2008). Under such circumstances, the environmental movement’s resistance to an innovation-driven future (Cohen 2006) becomes **ethically problematic** since it is precisely those activists that are needed to not only persuade mainstream politicians about the urgency of the ecological crisis but also to build public support for radical **investments in breakthrough technologies.** Recent paleoclimatological evidence suggests that in order to avoid reaching the tipping level for catastrophic climatic effects, the CO2 level in the atmosphere will need to be reduced from its current 385 ppm to at most 350 ppm, but likely even less than that (Hansen et al. 2008). However, with both India and China on a carbon-intensive path of rapid industrialisation with hundreds of new coal-fired plants currently under construction (Fairley 2007; Peng 2010), even optimistic calculations will see the atmospheric CO2 level approach 550 ppm in the coming decades (Sheehan et al. 2008). To achieve the reductions needed for climate stability will require a Herculean effort. With this in mind, it seems as if the **foremost duty of people in rich countries would be to develop the kind of new energy technology** that would make this industrial rise possible without causing irreversible environmental damage. Only if such technologies are substantially ‘faster, cleaner, and cheaper’ (Shellenberger et al. 2008) can we expect them to be implemented on a sufficient scale. By **individualising the site of political change, we risk losing the collective force** necessary to pursue such Herculean projects. Instead of offering a progressive vision of universal affluence that can bring together diverse (national) interests, the future becomes **marked by scarcity** and dependent on individual moral betterment. If we are right to assume that many people will be unable to meet the stringent demands of its moral code, then we can expect environmental citizenship theory to be more likely to feed **defeatism and resignation than meaningful action** (Butler 2010: 183). While some may hope for the market economy to autonomously provide the kind of technologies needed for global sustainability (Beckerman 1995), others, and even once staunch ‘deniers’ like Bjørn Lomborg, are now calling for political intervention and radical investments to meet the challenges of environmental change (Lomborg 2010).

#### Globalization resolves the root cause of conflict – interconnectedness and trade benefits provide cohesion between partner countries

Lindsay et. al. 3 (“The Globalization of Politics: American Foreign Policy for a New Century”, Council on Foreign Relations, Winter 2003, http://www.cfr.org/world/globalization-politics-american-foreign-policy-new-century/p6330)

September 11 signaled the end of the age of geopolitics and the advent of a new age— the era of global politics. The challenge U.S. policymakers face today is to recognize that fundamental change in world politics and to use America's unrivaled military, economic, and political power to fashion an international environment conducive to its interests and values. For much of the 20th century, geopolitics drove American foreign policy. Successive presidents sought to prevent any single country from dominating the centers of strategic power in Europe and Asia. To that end the United States fought two world wars and carried on its four-decade-long Cold War with the Soviet Union. The collapse of the Soviet empire ended the last serious challenge for territorial dominion over Eurasia. The primary goal of American foreign policy was achieved. During the 1990s, American foreign policy focused on consolidating its success. Together with its European allies, the United States set out to create, for the first time in history, a peaceful, undivided, and democratic Europe. That effort is now all but complete. The European Union— which will encompass most of Europe with the expected accession of 10 new members in 2004— has become the focal point for European policy on a wide range of issues. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization has evolved from a collective defense alliance into Europe's main security institution. A new relationship with Russia is being forged. Progress has been slower, though still significant, in Asia. U.S. relations with its two key regional partners, Japan and South Korea, remain the foundation of regional stability. Democracy is taking root in South Korea, the Philippines, Indonesia, and Taiwan. U.S. engagement with China is slowly tying an economically surging Beijing into the global economy. The success of American policy over the past decade means that no power— not Russia, not Germany, not a united Europe, and not China or Japan— today poses a hegemonic threat to Eurasia. In this new era, American foreign policy will no longer pivot on geography. Instead, it will be defined by the combination of America's unrivaled power in world affairs and the extensive and growing globalization of world politics. The Sole Global Power The United States is today the only truly global power. Its military reach— whether on land, at sea, or in the air— extends to every point on the globe. Its economic prowess fuels world trade and industry. Its political and cultural appeal— what Joseph Nye has called soft power— is so extensive that most international institutions reflect American interests. America's position in the world is unique— no other country in history has ever come close. But is America's exalted position sustainable? Militarily, the vast gap between the United States and everyone else is growing. Whereas defense spending in most other countries is falling, U.S. defense spending is rising rapidly. This year's requested increase in defense spending is greater than the entire Chinese defense budget. Most remarkably, America can afford to spend more. Defense spending takes a smaller share of the U.S. gross domestic product than it did a decade ago— and even the Bush administration's projected increases will produce an overall budget equal to only about 3.5 percent of GDP, about half of Cold War highs. There is little prospect of any country or group of countries devoting the resources necessary to begin competing with the United States militarily, let alone surpassing it. Economically, the United States may not widen its edge over its competitors, but neither is it likely to fall behind. The U.S. economy has proven itself at least as adept as its major competitors in realizing the productivity gains made possible by information technology. Europe and Japan face severe demographic challenges as their populations rapidly age, creating likely labor shortages and severe budgetary pressures. China is modernizing rapidly, and Russia may have turned the corner, but their economies today are comparable in output to those of Italy and Belgium— and they have yet to develop a political infrastructure that can support sustained economic growth. Which brings us to the issue of how to transform this unquestioned power into influence. Unless employed deftly, America's military and economic superiority can breed resentment, even among its friends. A growing perception that Washington cares only about its own interests and is willing to use its muscle to get its way has fueled a worrisome gap between U.S. and European attitudes. European elites increasingly criticize the United States as being morally, socially, and culturally retrograde— especially in its perceived embrace of the death penalty, predatory capitalism, and fast food and mass entertainment. Europe has also begun to exercise diplomatic muscle in international institutions and other arenas, seeking to create new international regimes designed to limit America's recourse to its hard power. The sustainability of American power ultimately depends on the extent to which others believe it is employed not just in U.S. interests but in their interests as well. Following its victory in World War II, the United States led the effort to create not only new security institutions, such as the United Nations and NATO, but also new regimes to promote economic recovery, development, and prosperity, such as the Marshall Plan, the Bretton Woods monetary system, and the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs to promote free trade. These institutions and agreements preserved and extended American power— but in a way that benefited all who participated. The challenge for the United States is to do the same today. Globalization Globalization is not just an economic phenomenon, but a political, cultural, military, and environmental one as well. Nor is globalization new; networks of interdependence spanning continents were increasing rapidly in the decades before the First World War as the steam engine and the telegraph reduced the cost of transportation and information. What distinguishes globalization today is the speed and volume of cross-border contacts. The prophets of globalization have trumpeted its benefits, particularly how the increased flow of goods, services, and capital across borders can boost economic activity and enhance prosperity. During the 1990s the more globalized economies grew an average of 5 percent a year, while the less globalized economies contracted by an average of 1 percent a year. The spread of ideas and information across the Internet and other global media has broadened cultural horizons and empowered people around the world to challenge autocratic rulers and advance the cause of human rights and democracy. Globalization can even lessen the chance of war. Fearing that war with Pakistan would disrupt their ties to U.S.-based multinationals, India's powerful electronic sector successfully pressed New Delhi in mid-2002 to deescalate its conflict with Pakistan.

#### Globalization is necessary to uphold American primacy

Lindsay et. al. 3 (“The Globalization of Politics: American Foreign Policy for a New Century”, Council on Foreign Relations, Winter 2003, http://www.cfr.org/world/globalization-politics-american-foreign-policy-new-century/p6330)

And the United States does differ from other countries. Unique among past hegemons in not seeking to expand its power through territorial gains, it is also unique among its contemporaries. Its primacy and global interests prompt others both to seek its assistance in addressing their problems and to resent it for meddling in their affairs. The ambivalence the world feels about American engagement— as well as the unique nature of that engagement— makes it imperative that the United States not mistake the conduct of foreign policy for a popularity contest. Doing the right thing may not always be popular— but it is vitally important nevertheless. But Globalists are right that while America is powerful, it is not omnipotent. Far more able than most countries to protect itself against the pernicious consequences of globalization, it is by no means invulnerable. Some crucial problems do defy unilateral solutions. Global warming is perhaps the most obvious case, but others include stopping the spread of weapons of mass destruction and fighting global terrorism. In other cases, such as protecting the American homeland from terrorist attack, unilateral action can reduce but not eliminate risks. Similarly, unilateral American power may not be enough to sustain the benefits of globalization. Globalization is not irreversible. World War I, the Russian Revolution, and the Great Depression combined to strangle the economic and social interactions that emerged early in the 20th century. Economic globalization today rests on an intricate web of international trade and financial institutions. Extending, developing, and improving these institutions requires the cooperation of others. Without it, the benefits of globalization, which help to underwrite American power, could erode. Globalization has greatly broadened America's foreign policy agenda. Infectious diseases, poverty, and poor governance not only offend our moral sensibilities but also represent potential new security threats. Failed and failing states endanger not just their own citizens but Americans as well. If the United States cannot find ways to encourage prosperity and good governance, it runs the risk of seeing threats to its security multiply. It could eventually find itself harmed not by bears in the woods but by swarms of tiny pests. Finally, cooperation can extend the life of American primacy. Working with others can spread the costs of action over a wider array of actors, enabling the United States to do more with less. By creating international regimes and organizations Washington can imbed its interests and values in institutions that will shape and constrain countries for decades, regardless of the vicissitudes of American power. And cooperation can build bonds with other countries, lessening the chances of cultural and political tactics that can over the years sap U.S. power.

#### Capitalism is key to the formation of successful space programs

Martin 10 (Robert, Amerika, June 21, <http://www.amerika.org/politics/centrifuge-capitalism/>, accessed: 3 July 2011)

Centralization and capitalism are necessary for any intelligent civilization, yet in excess drains the base population of any sustenance whatsoever, leaving them unemployed, homeless and starving at worst. The answer to this event is not a swing on the pendulum all the way onto total equality fisted socialism out on a plate for everyone who isn’t rich, that would be devastating for organization, but is a more natural ecosystem type of financing of a near-barter economics with different values and currencies for localized entities and more buoyant monetary for inter-localities – only monetizing where absolutely necessary. Without the higher economics that goes beyond small barter communities, there could be no space programs, or planetary defences providing the technology or the organization necessary to survive extinction events or fund a military etc, it’s critical for the structure of the superorganism – yet too much and some individuals inside of it become so padded from outside reality that they completely ignore the world around them.

#### Extinction – we have to go to space

Garan 10 – Astronaut (Ron, 3/30/10, Speech published in an article by Nancy Atkinson, “The Importance of Returning to the Moon,” <http://www.universetoday.com/61256/astronaut-explains-why-we-should-return-to-the-moon>)

Resources and Other Benefits: Since we live in a world of finite resources and the global population continues to grow, at some point the human race must utilize resources from space in order to survive. We are already constrained by our limited resources, and the decisions we make today will have a profound affect on the future of humanity. Using resources and energy from space will enable continued growth and the spread of prosperity to the developing world without destroying our planet. Our minimal investment in space exploration (less than 1 percent of the U.S. budget) reaps tremendous intangible benefits in almost every aspect of society, from technology development to high-tech jobs. When we reach the point of sustainable space operations we will be able to transform the world from a place where nations quarrel over scarce resources to one where the basic needs of all people are met and we unite in the common adventure of exploration. The first step is a sustainable permanent human lunar settlement.

#### They don’t have a concrete alternative – kills activism

Bryant ‘12

(Levi Bryant is currently a Professor of Philosophy at Collin College. In addition to working as a professor, Bryant has also served as a Lacanian psychoanalyst. He received his Ph.D. from Loyola University in Chicago, Illinois, where he originally studied 'disclosedness' with the Heidegger scholar Thomas Sheehan. Bryant later changed his dissertation topic to the transcendental empiricism of Gilles Deleuze, “Critique of the Academic Left”, http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/11/11/underpants-gnomes-a-critique-of-the-academic-left/)

I must be in a mood today– half irritated, half amused –because I find myself ranting. Of course, that’s not entirely unusual. So this afternoon I came across a post by a friend quoting something discussing the environmental movement that pushed all the right button. As the post read,¶ For mainstream environmentalism– conservationism, green consumerism, and resource management –humans are conceptually separated out of nature and mythically placed in privileged positions of authority and control over ecological communities and their nonhuman constituents. What emerges is the fiction of a marketplace of ‘raw materials’ and ‘resources’ through which human-centered wants, constructed as needs, might be satisfied. The mainstream narratives are replete with such metaphors [carbon trading!]. Natural complexity,, mutuality, and diversity are rendered virtually meaningless given discursive parameters that reduce nature to discrete units of exchange measuring extractive capacities. Jeff Shantz, “Green Syndicalism”¶ While finding elements this description perplexing– I can’t say that I see many environmentalists treating nature and culture as distinct or suggesting that we’re sovereigns of nature –I do agree that we conceive much of our relationship to the natural world in economic terms (not a surprise that capitalism is today a universal). This, however, is not what bothers me about this passage.¶ What I wonder is just what we’re supposed to do *even if* all of this is true? What, given existing conditions, are we to do if all of this is right? At least green consumerism, conservation, resource management, and things like carbon trading are engaging in activities that are making real differences. From this passage– and maybe the entire text would disabuse me of this conclusion –it sounds like we are to reject all of these interventions because they remain tied to a capitalist model of production that the author (and myself) find abhorrent. The idea seems to be that if we endorse these things we are tainting our hands and would therefore do well to reject them altogether.¶ The problem as I see it is that this is the worst sort of abstraction (in the Marxist sense) and wishful thinking. Within a Marxo-Hegelian context, a thought is abstract when it ignores all of the mediations in which a thing is embedded. For example, I understand a robust tree abstractly when I attribute its robustness, say, to its genetics alone, ignoring the complex relations to its soil, the air, sunshine, rainfall, etc., that also allowed it to grow robustly in this way. This is the sort of critique we’re always leveling against the neoliberals. They are abstract thinkers. In their doxa that individuals are entirely responsible for themselves and that they completely make themselves by pulling themselves up by their bootstraps, neoliberals ignore all the mediations belonging to the social and material context in which human beings develop that play a role in determining the vectors of their life. They ignore, for example, that George W. Bush grew up in a family that was highly connected to the world of business and government and that this gave him opportunities that someone living in a remote region of Alaska in a very different material infrastructure and set of family relations does not have. To think concretely is to engage in a cartography of these mediations, a mapping of these networks, from circumstance to circumstance (what I call an “onto-cartography”). It is to map assemblages, networks, or ecologies in the constitution of entities.¶ Unfortunately, the academic left falls prey to its own form of abstraction. It’s good at carrying out critiques that denounce various social formations, yet very poor at proposing any sort of realistic constructions of alternatives. This because it thinks abstractly in its own way, ignoring how networks, assemblages, structures, or regimes of attraction would have to be remade to create a workable alternative. Here I’m reminded by the “underpants gnomes” depicted in South Park:¶ The underpants gnomes have a plan for achieving profit that goes like this:¶ Phase 1: Collect Underpants¶ Phase 2: ?¶ Phase 3: Profit!¶ They even have a catchy song to go with their work:¶ Well this is sadly how it often is with the academic left. Our plan seems to be as follows:¶ Phase 1: Ultra-Radical Critique¶ Phase 2: ?¶ Phase 3: Revolution and complete social transformation!¶ Our problem is that we seem perpetually stuck at phase 1 without ever explaining what is to be done at phase 2. Often the critiques articulated at phase 1 are right, but there are nonetheless all sorts of problems with those critiques nonetheless. In order to reach phase 3, we have to produce new collectives. In order for new collectives to be produced, people need to be able to hear and understand the critiques developed at phase 1. Yet this is where everything begins to fall apart. Even though these critiques are often right, we express them in ways that only an academic with a PhD in critical theory and post-structural theory can understand. How exactly is Adorno to produce an effect in the world if only PhD’s in the humanities can understand him? Who are these things for? We seem to always ignore these things and then look down our noses with disdain at the Naomi Kleins and David Graebers of the world. To make matters worse, we publish our work in expensive academic journals that only universities can afford, with presses that don’t have a wide distribution, and give our talks at expensive hotels at academic conferences attended only by other academics. Again, who are these things for? Is it an accident that so many activists look away from these things with contempt, thinking their more about an academic industry and tenure, than producing change in the world? If a tree falls in a forest and no one is there to hear it, it doesn’t make a sound! Seriously dudes and dudettes, what are you doing?¶ But finally, and worst of all, us Marxists and anarchists all too often act like assholes. We denounce others, we condemn them, we berate them for not engaging with the questions we want to engage with, and we vilify them when they don’t embrace every bit of the doxa that we endorse. We are every bit as off-putting and unpleasant as the fundamentalist minister or the priest of the inquisition (have people yet understood that Deleuze and Guattari’s Anti-Oedipus was a critique of the French communist party system and the Stalinist party system, and the horrific passions that arise out of parties and identifications in general?). This type of “revolutionary” is the greatest friend of the reactionary and capitalist because they do more to drive people into the embrace of reigning ideology than to undermine reigning ideology. These are the people that keep Rush Limbaugh in business. Well done!¶ But this isn’t where our most serious shortcomings lie. Our most serious shortcomings are to be found at phase 2. We almost never make concrete proposals for how things ought to be restructured, for what new material infrastructures and semiotic fields need to be produced, *and when we do*, our critique-intoxicated cynics and skeptics immediately jump in with an analysis of all the ways in which these things contain dirty secrets, ugly motives, and are doomed to fail. How, I wonder, are we to do anything at all when we have no concrete proposals? We live on a planet of 6 billion people. These 6 billion people are dependent on a certain network of production and distribution to meet the needs of their consumption. That network of production and distribution does involve the extraction of resources, the production of food, the maintenance of paths of transit and communication, the disposal of waste, the building of shelters, the distribution of medicines, etc., etc., etc.¶ What are your proposals? How will you meet these problems? How will you navigate the existing mediations or semiotic and material features of infrastructure? Marx and Lenin had proposals. Do you? Have you even explored the cartography of the problem? Today we are so intellectually bankrupt on these points that we even have theorists speaking of events and acts and talking about a return to the old socialist party systems, ignoring the horror they generated, their failures, and not even proposing ways of avoiding the repetition of these horrors in a new system of organization. Who among our critical theorists is thinking seriously about how to build a distribution and production system that is responsive to the needs of global consumption, avoiding the problems of planned economy, ie., who is doing this in a way that gets notice in our circles? Who is addressing the problems of micro-fascism that arise with party systems (there’s a reason that it was the Negri & Hardt contingent, not the Badiou contingent that has been the heart of the occupy movement). At least the ecologists are thinking about these things in these terms because, well, they think ecologically. Sadly we need something more, a melding of the ecologists, the Marxists, and the anarchists. We’re not getting it yet though, as far as I can tell. Indeed, folks seem attracted to yet another critical paradigm, Laruelle.¶ I would love, just for a moment, to hear a radical environmentalist talk about his ideal high school that would be academically sound. How would he provide for the energy needs of that school? How would he meet building codes in an environmentally sound way? How would she provide food for the students? What would be her plan for waste disposal? And most importantly, how would she navigate the school board, the state legislature, the federal government, and all the families of these students? What is your plan? What is your alternative? I think there are alternatives. I saw one that approached an alternative in Rotterdam. If you want to make a truly revolutionary contribution, this is where you should start. Why should anyone even bother listening to you if you aren’t proposing real plans? But we haven’t even gotten to that point. Instead we’re like underpants gnomes, saying “revolution is the answer!” without addressing any of the infrastructural questions of just how revolution is to be produced, what alternatives it would offer, and how we would concretely go about building those alternatives. Masturbation.¶ “Underpants gnome” deserves to be a category in critical theory; a sort of synonym for self-congratulatory masturbation. We need less critique not because critique isn’t important or necessary– it is –but because we know the critiques, we know the problems. We’re intoxicated with critique because it’s easy and safe. We best every opponent with critique. We occupy a position of moral superiority with critique. But do we really do anything with critique? What we need today, more than ever, is composition or carpentry. Everyone knows something is wrong. Everyone knows this system is destructive and stacked against them. Even the Tea Party knows something is wrong with the economic system, despite having the wrong economic theory. None of us, however, are proposing alternatives. Instead we prefer to shout and denounce. Good luck with that.

#### Movements are getting smothered out of existence—no alternative economic system

Jones 11—Owen, Masters at Oxford, named one of the Daily Telegraph's 'Top 100 Most Influential People on the Left' for 2011, author of "Chavs: The Demonization of the Working Class", The Independent, UK, "Owen Jones: Protest without politics will change nothing", 2011, www.independent.co.uk/opinion/commentators/owen-jones-protest-without-politics-will-change-nothing-2373612.html

My first experience of police kettling was aged 16. It was May Day 2001, and the anti-globalisation movement was at its peak. The turn-of-the-century anti-capitalist movement feels largely forgotten today, but it was a big deal at the time. To a left-wing teenager growing up in an age of unchallenged neo-liberal triumphalism, just to have "anti-capitalism" flash up in the headlines was thrilling. Thousands of apparently unstoppable protesters chased the world's rulers from IMF to World Bank summits – from Seattle to Prague to Genoa – and the authorities were rattled. Today, as protesters in nearly a thousand cities across the world follow the example set by the Occupy Wall Street protests, it's worth pondering what happened to the anti-globalisation movement. Its activists did not lack passion or determination. But they did lack a coherent alternative to the neo-liberal project. With no clear political direction, the movement was easily swept away by the jingoism and turmoil that followed 9/11, just two months after Genoa. Don't get me wrong: the Occupy movement is a glimmer of sanity amid today's economic madness. By descending on the West's financial epicentres, it reminds us of how a crisis caused by the banks (a sentence that needs to be repeated until it becomes a cliché) has been cynically transformed into a crisis of public spending. The founding statement of Occupy London puts it succinctly: "We refuse to pay for the banks' crisis." The Occupiers direct their fire at the top 1 per cent, and rightly so – as US billionaire Warren Buffett confessed: "There's class warfare, all right, but it's my class, the rich class, that's making war, and we're winning." The Occupy movement has provoked fury from senior US Republicans such as Presidential contender Herman Cain who – predictably – labelled it "anti-American". They're right to be worried: those camping outside banks threaten to refocus attention on the real villains, and to act as a catalyst for wider dissent. But a coherent alternative to the tottering global economic order remains, it seems, as distant as ever. Neo-liberalism crashes around, half-dead, with no-one to administer the killer blow. There's always a presumption that a crisis of capitalism is good news for the left. Yet in the Great Depression, fascism consumed much of Europe. The economic crisis of the 1970s did lead to a resurgence of radicalism on both left and right. But, spearheaded by Thatcherism and Reaganism, the New Right definitively crushed its opposition in the 1980s.This time round, there doesn't even seem to be an alternative for the right to defeat. That's not the fault of the protesters. In truth, the left has never recovered from being virtually smothered out of existence. It was the victim of a perfect storm: the rise of the New Right; neo-liberal globalisation; and the repeated defeats suffered by the trade union movement. But, above all, it was the aftermath of the collapse of Communism that did for the left. As US neo-conservative Midge Decter triumphantly put it: "It's time to say: We've won. Goodbye." From the British Labour Party to the African National Congress, left-wing movements across the world hurtled to the right in an almost synchronised fashion. It was as though the left wing of the global political spectrum had been sliced off. That's why, although we live in an age of revolt, there remains no left to give it direction and purpose.

#### The alt can’t overcome the drive for hegemony- this is offense

Denney ’10 (Stephen Denney (Senior Editor for philosophy and politics at the Political Cartel Foundation) January 2010 “Great Power Politics: Not Dead, Just Napping” http://politicalcartel.org/2010/01/19/great-power-politics-not-dead-just-napping/)

Since the fundamental structure of the system remains unchanged, it’s absurd to think that the behavior of the various actors within it would suddenly alter their centuries-long methods and practices. States still fear one other and seek to gain power at the others’ expense. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the subsequent reconfiguration of eastern Europe at the end of the the Cold War certainly caused a major shift in the global distribution of power, but that’s about it. The structure of the international system remains the same: states seek to maximize their relative levels of power at the expense of others, with hegemony as the end goal.

#### The alternative is impossible and ensures mass-suffering

Barnhizer ‘6—David R. Emeritus Professor at Cleveland State University’s Cleveland-Marshall College of Law; “Waking from Sustainability's "Impossible Dream": The Decisionmaking Realities of Business and Government.” 2006 Georgetown International Environmental Law Review. 18 Geo. Int'l Envtl. L. Rev. 595 L/N

We face a combination of ecological, social, and economic crises. These crises involve the ability to fund potentially conflicting obligations for the provision of social benefits, health care, education, pensions, and poverty alleviation. They also include the need for massive expenditures to "fix" what we have already broken. n59 Part of the challenge is that in the United States and Europe we have made fiscal promises that we cannot keep. We also have vast economic needs for [\*620] continuing wealth generation as a precondition for achieving social equity on national and global levels. Figuring out how to reduce some of those obligations, eliminate others, and rebuild the core and vitality of our system must become a part of any honest social discourse. Even Pollyanna would be overwhelmed by the choices we face. There will be significant pain and sacrifice in any action we take. But failing to take prompt and effective action will produce even more catastrophic consequences. The scale of social needs, including the need for expanded productive activity, has grown so large that it cannot be shut off at all, and certainly not abruptly. It cannot even be ratcheted down in any significant fashion without producing serious harms to human societies and hundreds of millions of people. Even if it were possible to shift back to systems of local self-sufficiency, the consequences of the transition process would be catastrophic for many people and even deadly to the point of continual conflict, resource wars, increased poverty, and strife. What are needed are concrete, workable, and pragmatic strategies that produce effective and intelligently designed economic activity in specific contexts and, while seeking efficiency and conservation, place economic and social justice high on a list of priorities. n60 The imperative of economic growth applies not only to the needs and expectations of people in economically developed societies but also to people living in nations that are currently economically underdeveloped. Opportunities must be created, jobs must be generated in huge numbers, and economic resources expanded to address the tragedies of poverty and inequality. Unfortunately, natural systems must be exploited to achieve this; we cannot return to Eden. The question is not how to achieve a static state but how to achieve what is needed to advance social justice while avoiding and mitigating the most destructive consequences of our behavior. Many developing country groups involved in efforts to protect the environment and resist the impacts of free trade on their communities have been concerned with the harmful effects of economic change. Part of the concern is the increased scale of economic activity. Some concerns relate to who benefits and who loses in the changing context imposed by globalization. These concerns are legitimate and understandable. So are the other deep currents running beneath their political positions, including those of resistance to change of any kind and a [\*621] rejection of the market approach to economic activities. In the system described inaccurately as free market capitalism, economic activity not only breaks down existing systems, it creates new systems and--as Joseph Schumpeter observed--continually repeats the process through cycles of "creative destruction." n61 This pattern of creative destruction unfolds as necessarily and relentlessly as does the birth-maturation-death-rebirth cycle of the natural environment. This occurs even in a self-sufficient or autarkic market system capable of managing all variables within its closed dominion. But when the system breaks out of its closed environment, the ability of a single national actor to control the system's dynamics erodes and ultimately disappears in the face of differential conditions, needs, priorities, and agendas. Globalization's ability to produce wealth for a particular group simultaneously produces harms to different people and interests and generates unfair resource redistribution within existing cultures. This is an unavoidable consequence of globalization. n62 The problem is that globalization has altered the rules of operation of political, economic, and social activities, and in doing so multiplied greatly our ability to create benefit and harm. n63 While some understandably want the unsettling and often chaotic effects of globalization to go away, it can only be dealt with, not reversed. The system in which we live and work is no longer closed. There are few contexts not connected to the dynamics of some aspect of the extended economic and social systems resulting from globalization. This means the wide ranging and incompatible variables of a global economic, human rights, and social fairness system are resulting in conflicts and unanticipated interpenetrations that no one fully understands, anticipates, or controls. n64 Local [\*622] self-sufficiency is the loser in this process. It can remain a nostalgic dream but rarely a reality. Except for isolated cultures and niche activities, there is very little chance that anyone will be unaffected by this transformational process. Change is the constant, and it will take several generations before we return to a period of relative stasis. Even then it will only be a respite before the pattern once again intensifies.

#### Neoliberal policies led to internal Mexican reform

Kim 1/30/13 – (Dongwoo, “Modernization or Betrayal: Neoliberalism in Mexico”, Constellations, http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/constellations/article/view/18860/14650)

Carlos Salinas’ series of neoliberal economic policies culminated with the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) with the United States and Canada. Salinas was at first disinterested in forming a bilateral agreement with the United States.10 After all, the PRI had staunchly closed up the Mexican economy to the world for the last sixty years and gained popularity from its nationalist and defensive economic policies (especially against the United States), most notably the nationalization of the petroleum industry in late 1930s by president Lázaro Cárdenas. However, due to the “lukewarm” response from the world leaders during his European tour, which included a stop at the World Economic Forum in February of 1989, Salinas realized that the only way of drawing investors to Mexico was to “provide [them] with both cheap labor and privileged access to the U.S. market.”11 Salinas immediately approached the American government officials with the intention of negotiating a bilateral free trade agreement, shortly thereafter the administration shifted policies for the preparation and successful negotiation of NAFTA. Carlos Salinas thus marketed NAFTA with fervor in and outside of Mexico and hastened the pace of the neoliberal reforms. Salinas wrote that he made efforts to “disseminate more information and confirm the active presence of key economic, labor, and business leaders in working groups” during the period of NAFTA negotiation.12 His administration privatized public corporations and implemented land reforms. Furthermore, Carlos Salinas marketed his neoliberal policies as means of modernizing the Mexican politics as well, thus associating neoliberalism with democracy. In November 1990, Salinas said both political and economic problems, which he described as “clouds,” were “dissipating.”13 Some even referred to Salinas’ reforms as “Salinastroika,” paralleling these to the radical introduction of socio-political transparency and freedom in the former Soviet Union.14 The Salinas administration thus provided hope that these neoliberal economic policies would continue as political reforms as well. Seemingly, Carlos Salinas’ reforms were successful; his policies did draw foreign investments, Mexico relieved itself of a significant amount of debt and its economy grew by 4.4% in 1993.15 Salinas administration earned the reputation as a “political juggernaut” for its political competency.16 The elections for federal senators and state governors held in 1991 reflected the surging popularity of the Salinas administration; the PRI candidates won 61 percent of the congressional votes, giving Salinas “the power to make laws without having to seek any support from the opposition.”17 Most importantly, Carlos Salinas’ leadership earned the respect and confidence of foreign investors. According to Dillon and Preston, President Clinton praised Salinas for giving Mexico “better leadership than ever in [Clinton’s] lifetime” and The Wall Street Journal “looked favorably on [his] reforms.”18 Salinas was thus deemed a progressive and modern leader by the “first world,” and many believed that Mexico was truly modernizing.
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#### Aerospace – is separate from the other maquilas systems

Guidi 12 – competitive set in the larger media and information landscape consists of organizations focused on creating, partnering and providing global news and cultural perspectives content (Ruxandra, “US Aerospace and Defense Companies Set Up Shop in Mexico”, PRI, 1/6/12, http://pri.org/stories/2012-01-06/us-aerospace-and-defense-companies-set-shop-mexico)//javi

"People's perception about what cross-border manufacturing, what maquiladoras are like, is still based upon what was happening in the 70s and maybe the 1980s," said Kenn Morris, president of Crossborder Group, a San Diego-based market research firm. Morris said the aerospace industry along Mexico's north-western border is nothing like the stereotype of overcrowded, low-skilled factories. "The fact is that a lot of the factories," he said, listing medical devices, aerospace, and electronics, "they're building in such a way these days, and they're managed in such a way, that they can be put anywhere on the planet. But they're coming to Mexico." In the past five to 10 years, more than 50 aerospace and defense companies have started operations in Baja California, according to Mexico's trade ministry. Most of them are American, and they produce everything from electronic components to steel bolts for commercial and military aircraft. These companies employ more than 10,000 high-tech workers, many of them engineers, technicians and software developers. The companies choose this region for its proximity to the US and to western ports catering to Asian markets. But the main reason they come here is simple: the cost of even highly skilled labor is roughly half of what it is in the United States. In San Diego, a senior aerospace engineer makes on average $90,000. In Tijuana, an engineer with similar skills earns $35,000 to $45,000. Cobham, which produces defense systems, made the move to Tijuana in 1997. Inside its factory, workers dressed in royal blue coveralls sit in groups, looking into microscopes, holding tiny tweezers. "Over here we do the tuning and testing of the product," said Javier Urquizo, a plant manager at Cobham. But Urquizo can't tell me exactly what the product is. That's classified information. "So after we finalize the assembly, we need to tweak around some components to get the electrical responses required on the different frequencies," he said. The company has to apply for special licenses from the State Department to build those components here in Mexico – that's to make sure the raw materials and parts and the technology don't get into the wrong hands. Teresa Jesus Rio Ramos, a production supervisor here, said that aerospace and defense companies offer the most stable, best paid jobs of all the Tijuana maquilas. She makes around $1,800 a month. "I think our company is pretty financially stable," she said, "I don't have to worry from month to month whether I'll have a job or not. But that's not true for all maquilas in Tijuana; people get fired and rehired elsewhere all the time."

#### Deterrence is ethical—it forces responsibility and is fundamentally a defensive posture

**Colby ‘7**

(Elbridge. IOrbis v. 51 no3 Summer 2007)

In between these two extremes, deterrence is a security policy that offers a way forward for the United States that is not only more effective because more tailored, but is also more moral. It is more moral because a deterrent posture would entail a strategy that is more proportionate, more necessary, more responsive, and, ultimately, more just. Indeed, deterrence comports with the fundamental human intuition that it is generally only moral to ﬁght when attacked. In this it complies with the classical conception of just war, which mandates that wars only be conducted when one’s cause is just, waged by a legitimate authority, motivated by a right intent, fought with a real prospect of success, conducted proportionately, and undertaken only as a last resort. Deterrence satisﬁes these criteria. It is a defensive strategy that responds to invasions or attacks, and is therefore just; it sets out relatively clear guide-lines for when it mandates that the government ﬁght, and, therefore, is governed by legitimate authority. It is driven by a desire to protect, deter, and avenge, and is therefore motivated by right intent; its realistic red lines and threats are backed up by the awesome power of the United States, and therefore likely to succeed; and it responds when attacked and asks from the rest of the international community only respect for its marked out positions rather than revolutionary transformation, and is therefore proportional.22 Finally, by its nature it is undertaken as a last resort rather than preventively.23 It was the fundamental moral attractiveness of this position that continually frustrated both Soviet efforts to decouple Europe from the American nuclear umbrella during the Cold War and occasional American efforts to roll back the Soviet empire. **But theorizing about war and peace cannot remain at the level of abstraction. It must bear moral responsibility for actual consequence and the power of contingency,** as Max Weber pointed out.24 And deterrence, defense by calculation, uniquely satisﬁes the moral requirement that leaders, whatever their benevolent intentions, are basically responsible for the consequences that contingency produces from their actions. This it does by grounding a nation’s security on its own credible threats—not on either changing the world through force, as neo-conservatives advocate, nor by hoping that a more peaceful world will emerge, as the left proposes. Both of these extremes ground security on radical changes in the way the world operates, and, therefore, necessarily enmesh us in the rest of the world’s affairs, thereby exponentially expanding our vulnerability to all the permutations that chance and contingency may produce. Deterrence, rather, narrows our proﬁle, and thereby reduces our exposure to risk.

#### Threat real – Kim Jong Un openly said he would use nukes – most recent

The Telegraph 10/12/13 [“North Korea warns of 'all-out war' as it refuses to sign pact with US”, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/northamerica/usa/10374660/North-Korea-warns-of-all-out-war-as-it-refuses-to-sign-pact-with-US.html>, accessed: 10/16/13, ML]

North Korea has issued a fresh warning of an "all-out war", urging the United States to stop military drills and what it described as "nuclear blackmail". The country also refused to sign a non-aggression pact that John Kerry, the US Secretary of State, offered last week on condition of denuclearisation. In a thinly veiled threat to strike the United States, the North's National Defence Commission (NDC), chaired by leader Kim Jong-Un, said the US government must withdraw its policy of hostility against the North if it wants peace on both the Korean peninsula and the "US mainland". "(The United States) must bear it in mind that reckless provocative acts would meet our retaliatory strikes and lead to an all-out war of justice for a final showdown with the United States," a spokesman of the NDC was quoted as saying in a statement carried by Pyongyang's Korean Central News Agency. "We emphasise again that the United States must withdraw various measures aimed to isolate and strangulate us. Dependent upon this are... peace and security, not only on the Korean peninsula but the US mainland as well." The comments come after a two-day joint naval drill between Japan, South Korea and the US, which included an American nuclear aircraft carrier, sparked a series of angry responses and threats from Pyongyang. On Friday the North slammed a naval drill by US, South Korean and Japanese warships as a "serious military provocation" and vowed to "bury in the sea" the American carrier taking part in the exercise.

#### Pan is wrong – China is ontologically insecure and has chosen nationalism

Krolikowski 2008 (Alanna is a doctoral student in International Relations at the Department of Political Science of the University of Toronto. She completed an MA in International Relations at the Munk Centre for International Relations of the University of Toronto in August 2006; State Personhood in Ontological Security Theories of International Relations and Chinese Nationalism: A Sceptical View: http://www.utoronto.ca/ethnicstudies/Krolikowski\_2008.pdf)

According to such an approach, the history of the Chinese state-as-actor suggests that it should be a relatively straightforward case of unhealthy basic trust and ontological insecurity. Historians andpolitical scientists studying China, from SSu-yuTeng and John Lewis Fairbank onward, have stressed the profound civilizational rupture that China experienced with its first “encounter with the West.”37 The traumas associated with subsequent colonization and exploitation shattered China’s self-understanding as the beneficent “Middle Kingdom” and exposed as illusory its long-held beliefs about the pacific nature of its external environment and its own place within it.38 These processes can be understood as having lead to a deep form of existential crisis that, while being in a sense ‘acute,’has also been sustained over generations.39 The numerous upheavals experienced by the Chinese civilization during the 20th century, especially the most recent Tiananmen Square Massacre and ensuing international isolation, can no doubt count among the major disruptions to China’s sense of a continuous “biographical” narrative. As Chih-yu Shih recounts, the issue of outwardly oriented self-representation has also “been intrinsically related to China’s domestic institutional array”:40One witnesses the change of China’sself-image from a ‘socialist China’externally allied with the Soviet Unionand internally embodied in central planning and land reform, to a‘revolutionary China’externallyantagonistic toward bothsuperpowers and internallyplagued by theCultural Revolutions, and then to an ‘experimental China’ externally lauding independence and internally praising decentralisation. The most recent shift is toward a ‘normal China’ externally looking for partnership and internally enforcing economic reform. All these changes have required a new theory of the world. Whilethis series of redefinitions certainly suggests the capacity for identity change, because these historical changes have required fundamental and often violent reconstitutions of the Chinese state and sweeping reassessments of the international environment, they should be understood as traumatic disruptionsrather than reflexive developments of China’s self-identity. The resulting sense of existentialanxiety about its ownself-identity and the nature of its environment shouldmake of China an ontologically insecure actorwith rigid basic trust. The condition of unhealthy basic trust which prevents China from quelling its existential anxiety and ontological insecurity should, according to the theory, compel China to engage in routinizing behaviours as a means of achieving a stable self-identity and a sense of ontological security. More specifically, we should expect ontological insecurity to prompt the reinforcement of an existing identity through routinized relationships. A state locked into this type of condition should systematically reproduce similar forms of behaviour with other actors as a means of stabilizing its identity. We should observe constant patterns inthe state’s behaviour, includingrigid, inflexible positions on international issues; a persistent loyalty to states with which it has routinized friendly or cooperative relations; and lasting animosity, hostility or rivalry withstates that it is used to regarding as threats. Empirical observations disconfirming this hypothesis would include the absence of such patterns and, in their stead, change over time, flexibility in the state’s responses to different situations, adaptation and learning.

### 1ar – manufacturing

#### Layne thinks America needs a maritime strategy with Carriers to operationalize his strategy and avoid the impacts associated with a major ground-forces redeployments

**Schmitt 07**

PhD Schmitt, resident scholar and director of strategic studies at AEI, earned PhD at the University of Chicago, former professor at Johns Hopkins University, former Fellow at the Brookings Institution, 6-22-07 (Gary J., “To Be, or Not to Be . . . an Empire,” American Enterprise Institute, National Security Outlook, Short Publications)

Layne's argument is that there is, in fact, a realist alternative to the endless pursuit of primacy: a strategy of "offshore balancing" that amounts to a quasi-isolationist policy of selective diplomatic and military engagement. Indeed, the "offensive" realist argument for primacy rests, Layne suggests, on paying too much attention to the lessons supposedly learned from the security problems and strategies for dealing with them that arose from centuries of competition among the powers of continental Europe. Given America's geography and weak neighbors, the security model far more relevant to our situation is the one adopted by maritime Britain: a small army, a big fleet, and a willingness to find new allies quickly and dump old ones when necessary. Today's primacy advocates couple it with a policy of democracy promotion, believing that the world is safer when there are more democracies, not fewer--a thesis Layne calls the most "over-hyped and under-supported 'theory' ever to be concocted by American academics."[3] According to Layne, the advantage of his alternative grand strategy is that it avoids stimulating great power rivalries, eliminates the economically disastrous consequences of "imperial overstretch," and precludes the necessity of a "national security state" in which our rights and civic culture are put at risk. Finally, it avoids the messes of democracy promotion and nation-building (e.g., Somalia and Iraq). Problems and Prospects International security specialists will quibble that Thayer's and Layne's two grand strategies are not the sum total of strategies available to the "American empire." Nor will they be satisfied with the authors' loose use of the term "empire." That Thayer and Layne both admit the United States is not an empire in the traditional sense seems to suggest that the country is not, in fact, an empire. Hegemony and empire are not one and the same, although their attributes can at times overlap. That said, the book provides plenty of fodder for debate and thought. Its biggest problem, however, lies in Layne's dyspeptic analysis of current policy opponents. Rather than taking the opposing argument as seriously as Thayer takes his, Layne resorts to unsubstantiated claims about "neocons," White House lies, and cabals (the "Blue Team") trying to foment a "preventive" war with China.[4] Similarly, his dismissal of the democratic peace theory is equally over-the-top. Even if one thinks that the theory is at times oversold, to claim that it has absolutely no merit leaves readers with the sense that there is as much anger as argument in Layne's case. An additional problem, perhaps tied to the way the book is structured, is that Layne spends the majority of his time criticizing the argument for primacy without giving the reader much of a handle on the particulars of his own preferred strategy. As a result, we do not know whether his model of "offshore balancing" is more British in style--that is, fairly active in playing the decisive power broker among the other competing states--or more passive in content, such as the United States in the 1920s and 1930s. If the former, a key problem with the strategy is that it requires a far more calculating style of statecraft than the United States has ever had. And even if we had Henry Kissinger upon Henry Kissinger to carry it out, would the American people really let their government play this particular game of international politics, shifting partners based on power relations rather than on the character of the states themselves? The disappearance of the United States as a security guarantor is likely to lead to more competition among states and to the creation of a more chaotic and fluid international environment. Britain had a hard enough time playing this role in its day, finding itself in numerous conflicts regardless. If the latter, the passive offshore balancing approach leads to the question of whether such a strategy results in putting off a security challenge until it may be far more difficult to deal with. Layne's bet, at least in the case of Iran and China today, is that if the United States would only get out of the way, other powers would naturally begin to meet the challenge. It is possible, but doing so might create even more destabilizing competition among other regional powers or lead those same powers to acquiesce to China or Iran's new hegemony, fueling their ambitions rather than lessening them. The history of international relations suggests that most great crises result from neglecting to address more minor ones early on. As Thayer argues, it is probably less costly to nip these threats in the bud to than wait for them to become full-blown security crises. And speaking of money, Layne's argument about looming imperial overstretch is itself a stretch. Even with all the problems in Iraq, a war in Afghanistan, and an emerging hedging strategy vis-à-vis China, the defense burden is still barely over 4 percent of the U.S. gross domestic product. The United States has had far higher defense burdens in the past while still retaining its status as the world's economic juggernaut. There may be plenty of reasons to worry about the U.S. economy, but "guns over butter" is not one of them. Moreover, while pulling back from a forward-leaning defense strategy would undoubtedly save money, offshore balancing would still require the United States to have a major military establishment in reserve if it wanted to be capable of being a decisive player in a game of great power balancing. Is the $100 billion or so saved--or, rather, spent by Congress on "bridges to nowhere"--really worth the loss in global influence that comes from adopting Layne's strategy?