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#### Economic engagement must be quid-pro-quo

Shinn 96 [James Shinn, C.V. Starr Senior Fellow for Asia at the CFR in New York City and director of the council’s multi-year Asia Project, worked on economic affairs in the East Asia Bureau of the US Dept of State, “Weaving the Net: Conditional Engagement with China,” pp. 9 and 11, google books]

In sum, conditional engagement consists of a set of objectives, a strategy for attaining those objectives, and tactics (specific policies) for implementing that strategy. The objectives of conditional engagement are the ten principles, which were selected to preserve American vital interests in Asia while accommodating China’s emergence as a major power. The overall strategy of conditional engagement follows two parallel lines: economic engagement, to promote the integration of China into the global trading and financial systems; and security engagement, to encourage compliance with the ten principles by diplomatic and military means when economic incentives do not suffice, in order to hedge against the risk of the emergence of a belligerent China. The tactics of economic engagement should promote China’s economic integration through negotiations on trade liberalization, institution building, and educational exchanges. While a carrots-and-sticks approach may be appropriate within the economic arena, the use of trade sanction to achieve short-term political goals is discouraged. The tactics of security engagement should reduce the risks posed by China’s rapid military expansion, its lack of transparency, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and transnational problems such as crime and illegal migration, by engaging in arms control negotiations, multilateral efforts, and a loosely-structured defensive military arrangement in Asia.8 [To footnotes] 8. Conditional engagement’s recommended tactics of tit-for-tat responses are equivalent to using carrots and sticks in response to foreign policy actions by China. Economic engagement calls for what is described as symmetric tit-for-tat and security engagement for asymmetric tit-for-tat. A symmetric response is one that counters a move by China in the same place, time, and manner; an asymmetric response might occur in another place at another time, and perhaps in another manner. A symmetric tit-for-tat would be for Washington to counter a Chinese tariff of 10 percent on imports for the United States with a tariff of 10 percent on imports from China. An asymmetric tit-for-tat would be for the United States to counter a Chines shipment of missiles to Iran with an American shipment of F-16s to Vietnam (John Lewis Gaddis, Strategies of Containment: A critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy. New York: Oxford University Press, (1982). This is also cited in Fareed Zakaria, “The Reagan Strategy of Containment,” Political Science Quarterly 105, no. 3 (1990), pp. 383-88).

### G000V PIC

#### [CP TEXT: Thus Vikram and I advocate the United States federal terrocrats should substantially increase its economic engagement towards Mexico by investing in seawater irrigation in Mexican deserts.]

#### “Government” doesn’t exist – the word is a lie that hides individual responsibility and legitimizes physical violence.

Frederick Mann, B.A., Communications @ Sanford University; Founder, Terra Libra, 1998, “‘The Nature of Government’.”

Human Nature and "Government" If we regard "government" as a "human institution" created by human beings and consisting of human beings, then an inquiry about the "nature of government" can reasonably start with an inquiry about "human nature." It seems reasonable that some aspects of "human nature" will be reflected in the "nature of government." Our enquiry could start with two reports. A very important aspect of human nature is that many of us present our good traits to others, while hiding our bad traits. This also applies to people who present themselves as "helpers." Whenever people present themselves as "helpers" to you, it's prudent to be careful -- particularly if they ask you to pay a lot for the "help." If they attempt to compel you to accept their "help," whether you ask for it or not, then you may want to be doubly careful. And if they attempt to force you (at gunpoint or otherwise) to pay for their "help," you may want to become suspicious about their real intentions. See #TL15A: THE GOOD AND THE BAD. / In his book 'Why Government Doesn't Work,' Harry Browne writes: “Government” dominates our lives; it is at the center of most news and most public discussion. And yet no one person in a hundred can explain what we mean by "government," and no school or textbook bothers to provide a precise definition." / "The distinctive feature of government is coercion -- the use of force and the threat of force to win obedience. This is how government differs from every other agency in society. The others persuade; government compels." / "So what is government? Very simply, it is an agency of coercion." / "Of course, there are other agencies of coercion -- such as the Mafia. So to be more precise, government is the agency of coercion that has flags in front of its offices." / "Or, to put it another way, government is society's dominant producer of coercion. The Mafia and independent bandits are merely fringe competitors -- seeking to take advantage of the niches and nooks neglected by government." / If "government" is an agency of coercion, it may be worthwhile to explore what we mean by "coercion." What if many people tend to be blind to subtle forms of coercion? What if some forms of coercion are perpetrated in disguised and indirect ways? See WHY YOU MUST RECOGNIZE AND UNDERSTAND COERCION (about two-thirds down the page in the right-hand column). / Some people argue that because human nature is inherently evil, therefore "government" is necessary to control people to curb their evil behavior. This is a fallacious argument. It's like saying you must appoint a fox to guard the hens. If people are evil, then a "government" consisting of people will ipso facto also be evil. For more on this issue, see Human Nature, Anarchy, and Capitalism by Kelley L. Ross, Ph.D. It seems reasonable to me that the evil in the Mafia is greater than the evil in the general population. Why should anyone expect "government" to be any different? / "By far the most numerous and most flagrant violations of personal liberty and individual rights are performed by governments... The major crimes throughout history, the ones executed on the largest scale, have been committed not by individuals or bands of individuals but by governments, as a deliberate policy of those governments... that is, by the official representatives of governments, acting in their official capacity." -- John Hospers / See Government Death Machines..., Death by Government and American Holocaust: The Genocide of the Native American Peoples and the Theft of Their Land. Maybe the main differences are that "government" evil tends to occur on a much wider scale than Mafia evil, and that people in "government" are better at disguising their evil than the Mafiosi. / "As nightfall does not come at once, neither does oppression. In both instances, there's a twilight where everything remains seemingly unchanged, and it is in such twilight that we must be aware of change in the air, however slight, lest we become unwitting victims of the darkness." -- William O. Douglas ("Supreme Court Justice") / "Man can hardly recognize the devils of his own creation." -- Albert Schweitzer / "There are always a few, better endowed than others, who feel the weight of the yoke and cannot restrain themselves from attempting to shake it off... These are in fact the men who, possessed of clear minds and far-sighted spirit, are not satisfied, like the brutish mass, to see only what is at their feet, but rather look about them, behind and before, and even recall the things of the past in order to judge those of the future, and compare both with their present condition. These are the ones who, having good minds of their own, have further trained them by study and learning. Even if liberty had entirely perished from the earth, such men would reinvent it. For them slavery has no satisfactions, no matter how well disguised." --Etienne de la Boetie ('The Discourse of Voluntary Servitude') / Here are some more articles on and references to human nature and politics: # Taoism and Libertarianism by Wolf Logan # Six Myths About Libertarianism by Murray N. Rothbard # Rain, Kropotkin and Y2K -- Reel Human Nature by L. Reichard White # WHY I'M A LIBERTARIAN by Mack Tanner # The Untamed Rabble by Noam Chomsky # A Reader's Guide to Libertarian Theory by Julian Sanchez # Human Nature and the Free Society by Edmund A. Opitz / "Government" as "Legal Plunder" / "Everyone wants to live at the expense of the State. They forget that the State lives at the expense of everyone." -- Frederic Bastiat / "Legal plunder can be committed in an infinite number of plans for organizing it: tariffs, protection, benefits, subsidies, encouragements, progressive taxation, public schools, guaranteed jobs, guaranteed profits, minimum wages, a right to relief, a right to the tools of labor, free credit, and son on, and so on. All these plans as a whole - with their common aim of legal plunder - constitute socialism." -- Frederic Bastiat / "When plunder is organized by law for the profit of those who make the law, all the plundered classes try somehow to enter - by peaceful or revolutionary means - into the making of laws." -- Frederic Bastiat / "Sometimes the law defends plunder and participates in it... Sometimes the law places the whole apparatus of judges, police, prisons, and gendarmes at the service of the plunderers, and treats the victim - when he defends himself - as a criminal. In short, there is legal plunder." -- Frederic Bastiat / "All government, in its essence, is organized exploitation, and in virtually all of its existing forms it is the implacable enemy of every industrious and well-disposed man." -- H.L. Mencken / "Once a right to collective looting has been substituted for the right of each person to have whatever he has produced, it is not at all surprising to find the official dispensers deciding that it is right for them to loot the loot - for a "worthy" purpose, of course. Then we have the loot used by the insiders to buy votes so that they may stay in power; we have political pork barrels and lobbying for the contents; we have political patronage for political loyalty - even for loyalty to immoral conduct." -- F.A. Harper / "Thievery and covetousness will persist and grow, and the basic morals of ourselves, our children, and our children's children will continue to deteriorate unless we destroy the virus of immorality that is embedded in the concept of the Welfare State; unless we come to understand how the moral code of individual conduct must apply also to collective conduct, because the collective is composed solely of individuals." -- F.A. Harper / "There is no worse tyranny than to force a man to pay for what he does not want merely because you think it would be good for him." -- Robert Heinlein ('The Moon is a Harsh Mistress') / "The law was made for one thing alone, for the exploitation of those who don't understand it, or are prevented by naked misery from obeying it." -- Bertold Brecht (The Threepenny Opera) / # 'The Law' by Frederic Bastiat # The Proper Role of Government by Ezra Taft Benson # The Anatomy of the State by Murray N. Rothbard # 'THE ECONOMIC RAPE OF AMERICA' # Shakedown : How the Government Screws You from A to Z by James Bovard # Asset Forfeiture # FEAR (Forfeiture Endangers American Rights) / More Definitions of Government / "Government is not reason, it is not eloquence, it is force; like fire, a dangerous servant and fearful master." -- George Washington / "Governments are triumphant monopolies of murder, robbery, swindling and all that is atrocious and detestable. Ever since the beginning, they have forced mankind to kill or prepare and hold themselves in readiness to kill each other by the thousands and even millions at a time, and by the cruelest and most destructive means that spite can devise." -- Calvin Blanchard (1865) / "The state represents violence in a concentrated and organized form. The individual has a soul, but as the state is a soulless machine, it can never be weaned from violence to which it owes its very existence." -- Mahatma Gandhi / "A government, at bottom, is nothing more than a gang of men, and as a practical matter most of them are inferior men. Government is actually the worst failure of civilized man. There has never been a really good one, and even those that are most tolerable are arbitrary, cruel, grasping and unintelligent. Indeed, it would not be far wrong to describe the best as the common enemy of all decent citizens." -- H.L. Mencken / "All governments are comprised of two layers: A large number of bureaucrats at the bottom, and a small number of politicians at the top. Politicians are persons who are invested with an above average AIQ (Aggressiveness/Intelligence Quotient - see Chapt. 09.04: War; Chapt. 06.01: Intelligence). The combination of their aggressiveness with their relatively high intelligence enables politicians to prod the general population into compliance with their wishes and desires. Some governments may be more aggressive than others, but all governments have in common the ability and the willingness to use force, or the threat of force, to perpetuate their existence and to bring about compliance with the wishes of its leadership. The secondary and progressively lower layers of government consist of large numbers of "public servants" who act as the bureaucratic executives of the dominant layer of government...Two hundred years ago, the French philosopher Rousseau formulated the basic principle of interaction between man and his governments: "The less government, the better off its citizenry." This simple but axiomatic statement remains the ultimate foundation of individual freedom. Human beings are only free to the extent that governments are inefficient. The desirability of governments is not a black and white situation. The advantages and disadvantages of a particular government revolve around many shades of grey. In his seminal work, "The Wealth of Nations", Adam Smith set forth three, and only three, legitimate functions of any government: 1.) The judiciary, 2.) the protection of the country against foreign enemies, and 3.) the infrastructure, such as highways and bridges. To these factors we could add the "safety net" as a modern, enlightened contribution of government." -- Walter E. Requadt / See also: # #TL06 - DISCOURSE ON VOLUNTARY SERVITUDE # #TL07: THE CONSTITUTION OF NO AUTHORITY. # Lies Our Forefathers Told Us by Victor Milan / A Classic Description of the State "There are still peoples and herds somewhere, but not with us, my brothers: here there are states. The state? What is that? Well then! Now open your ears, for now I shall speak to you of the death of peoples. The state is the coldest of all cold monsters. Coldly it lies, too; and this lie creeps >>>from its mouth; 'I, the state, am the people.' It is a lie! It was creators who created peoples and hung a faith and a love over them: thus they served life. It is destroyers who set snares for many and call it the state: they hang a sword and a hundred desires over them. Where a people still exists, there the people do not understand the state and hate it as the evil eye and sin against custom and law. I offer you this sign: every people speaks its own language of good and evil: its neighbor does not understand this language. It invented this language for itself in custom and law. But the state lies in all languages of good and evil; and whatever it says, it lies - and whatever it has, it has stolen. Everything about it is false; it bites with stolen teeth. Even its belly is false. Confusion of the language of good and evil; I offer you this sign of the state. Truly, this sign indicates the will to death! Truly, it beckons to the preachers of death! Many too many are born: the state was invented for the superfluous! Just see how it lures them, the many-too-many! How it devours them, and chews them, and re-chews them! ... It would like to range heroes and honorable men about it, this new idol! It likes to sun itself in the sunshine of good consciences - this cold monster! It will give you everything if you worship it, this new idol: thus it buys for itself the luster of your virtues and the glance of your proud eyes. It wants to use you to lure the many-too-many. Yes, a cunning device of Hell has here been devised, a horse of death jingling with the trappings of divine honors! Yes, a death for many has here been devised that glorifies itself as life: truly a heart-felt service to all preachers of death! I call it the state where everyone, good and bad, is a poison-drinker: the state where everyone, good and bad, loses himself: the state where universal slow suicide is called - life." / This is how Friedrich Nietzsche described "the state" in his classic Thus Spoke Zarathustra, in 1884. Typically, in the history classes taught in the last generation in "government schools" in America, when Nietzsche is discussed, he is depicted as the forefather of Hitler's Nazi ideology. Nothing could be further from the truth. Nietzsche was probably the most penetrative philosopher and psychologist there has ever been. He saw right through the falsehoods on which "government" rests. Fifty years before Hitler came to power he was already disgusted at what he saw happening in Germany. He predicted that Germany would suffer a horrible calamity. He was so disgusted that he renounced his German roots and became a Swiss citizen. The Nazis did take some of Nietzsche's statements out of context and used them as slogans. But to teach that Nietzsche inspired the Nazis is pure brainwashing. Nietzsche clearly saw what a destructive disaster "the German state" was and expressed his view in unequivocal terms. Maybe that's why "government monopoly schoolteachers" try so hard to discredit him. / Nietzsche's is a pretty good description, but I doubt that it's communicable to but a few. Although Nietzsche did make it to the front page of Time magazine with his pronouncement "God is dead," he never got anywhere with "the state is dead." Nevertheless, he did indicate that "everything the state says is a lie" and "everything it has it has stolen." He did indicate that "the state" is an idol and an instrument of death. He also pointed out the "confusion of the language of good and evil." / Digging Deeper In #FFP05: HARRY BROWNE'S FREEDOM PRINCIPLES you can find Harry Browne's four "Government Traps," to which I've added 11 more: / \* Government Trap #1: The belief that governments perform socially useful functions that deserve your support. / \* Government Trap #2: The belief that you have a duty to obey laws. / \* Government Trap #3: The belief that the government can be counted upon to carry out a social reform you favor. / \* Government Trap #4: The fear that the government is so powerful that it can prevent you from being free. / \* Government Trap #5: The belief that government people can do anything better than other people. Government people don?t have any special magical powers. / \* Government Trap #6: The belief that governments will produce beneficial results. Because government people essentially collect their income at the point of a gun, they don?t have to produce anything worthwhile to survive. In fact, their incentive is to make all problems worse so they can demand more taxes to "solve" the problems. / \* Government Trap #7: The belief that government represents the people. Governments consist of individuals. Individuals always represent themselves. To think otherwise is a delusion. / \* Government Trap #8: The belief that government can conjure up resources from thin air. Everything government has, was essentially stolen at the point of a gun. / \* Government Trap #9: The belief that government provides protection. Just look at the crime statistics. / \* Government Trap #10: The belief that certain activities or functions must be done by government. Government consists of people. These people don't have any special magical powers. / \* Government Trap #11: The belief that government must or can control people. Because only individuals control the energy that animates their bodies, it’s really impossible for anyone to control anyone else. However, people can relinquish self-control by choice or unwittingly. / \* Government Trap #12: The belief that you have to do something about solving the problem of government. You are best off solving your own problems. In addition, you may also want to persuade a few others to solve their own problems. If enough people solved their own problems, the problem of government will disappear. / \* Government Trap #13: The belief that government exists as a volitional entity. When having to deal with "government," you always have to deal with individual human beings. Realizing this helps make you much more effective in warding off any attempts by individual government people to violate your freedom. Rather than having to handle "the government," you have to handle one or a few specific individuals. / \* Government Trap #14: The belief that the government?s constitution is a valid, legal contract. All the government constitutions I know of are fraudulent hoaxes. For a contract to be valid it must be entered into knowingly, intentionally, and explicitly. Have you ever signed any so-called "constitution" of any supposed "country?" What if all coercive political systems are fraudulent hoaxes? See #TL07: The Constitution of No Authority . / \* Government Trap #15: The belief that government can make laws. In the final analysis, the noises and scribbles that emanate from the mouths and pens of government officials are just noises and scribbles. The power you ascribe to these noises and scribbles is your choice. See #TL07H: CONVERSATIONS ABOUT DEEP STUPIDITIES. / Most people, including libertarians, anarchists, and other freedom lovers, take it for granted that there is an entity called "government" or "state" that can do things. / "The State is the great fictitious entity by which everyone expects to live at the expense of everyone else." -- Frederic Bastiat / "Traditional anarchists want to abolish the "State." In planning their strategies and in doing their thinking about this they rarely question the existence or fundamental nature of their enemy. This situation wouldn't be so bad if it wasn't for the fact that their mistaken beliefs often lead them into counterproductive political strategies. Thus we observe the ludicrous sight of self-named anarchists joining political parties (usually the Libertarian Party) in order to hasten the end of the system. The idea seems to be: We can remove it by being absorbed by it!" -- Dr. Max More (writing as Max T. O'Connor) -- #TL07D: DEEP ANARCHY -- AN ELIMINATIVIST VIEW OF "THE STATE" / Ernst Cassirer wrote an important book 'The Myth of the State.' I've compiled a report with extracts from 'The Myth of the State' and 'An Essay on Man' (also be Cassirer) -- see #TL071: ERNST CASSIRER AND "PRIMEVAL STUPIDITY". My report may shed further light on what kind of "creatures" (mythological?) "government" and "state" are. / Description of "Government" First, I'm going to provide my comprehensive primary description (or definition, if you like) of "government." Then I'll elaborate further on aspects of this description. I'll also cover some secondary descriptions of "government." It'll also be necessary to explain certain thinking skills that are necessary to grasp the descriptions. Finally, a few important related topics and arguments will be briefly covered, as well as the benefits of understanding and applying the information in this article. / Primary Description of "Government" "Government" is a granfalloon, a scam, a hoax, a fraud, a swindle, a theatrical tragicomedy, and a form of parasitism or cannibalism kept in place by certain fraud-words, by superstition, by idolatry, by gullibility, by lack of thinking skills, by brainwashing, by mass hallucination, by terror, and by violence -- also characterized by compulsive lying, economic rape and value destruction, serial killing, war mongering, mass murder, quackery of the deadliest kind, primitive "alpha-ape" behavior, and the abuse of hierarchical systems. / "Government" is a "Granfalloon" In his book Cat's Cradle, Kurt Vonnegut coined the word "granfalloon" to describe abstract concepts like "nation," "state," "country," "government," "society," "IBM," etc. He wrote, "To discover the substance of a granfalloon, just prick a hole in a toy balloon." In his book The Incredible Secret Money Machine, Don Lancaster explains: / "A granfalloon is any large bureaucratic figment of people's imagination. For instance, there's really no such thing as the Feds or the General Veeblefeltzer Corporation. There are a bunch of people out there that relate to each other, and there's some structures, and some paper. In fact, there's lots and lots of paper. The people sit in the structures and pass paper back and forth to each other and charge you to do so. / All these people, structures, and paper are real. But nowhere can you point to the larger concept of "government" or "corporation" and say, "There it is, kiddies!" The monolithic, big "they" is all in your mind." [emphasis added] / A granfalloon is the lumping together of many diverse elements into an abstract collection, and to then think and speak as if the abstract collection is one single entity capable of performing actions. This phenomenon leads people to say things like "the government runs the country." I hope you realize (or will soon) just how absurd the previous sentence is. / "Government" Consists of Individual Human Beings The human brain is an abstracting device. We might call the first level of abstraction the "concrete abstract." Consider the concept "table." The concept or word corresponds to and represents a physical object "table." However, the concept "table" is more general than the object "table" - because the concept "table" can be applied to any of a large number of objects with flat surfaces and (usually) four legs; whereas the physical object "table" is one specific object. / Our next level of abstraction we might call the "collective abstract" - for example, "furniture." It's very useful to lump together a number of diverse but related objects and use the abstract word or concept "furniture" to represent all of them. It makes thinking and communicating more efficient. Instead of saying, "Clean the chairs, the tables, the shelves, the mirrors, the cupboards, etc.," you can simply say, "Clean the furniture." It's much more efficient. But with the increase in efficiency comes a potential lack of distinction... / "Government" can be described as a collection of individuals, pieces of paper, buildings, weaponry, etc. Let's take a look at what becomes possible when we think in terms of individual human beings, instead of the monolithic collective abstract "government" - a two-sentence refutation of all the arguments for "government": / \* "Government" consists of individual human beings - or people. / \* When people say "government is necessary to do X (whatever)," or "only government can do X," or "government must do for people what they can't do for themselves" - what they're really saying is: "people are necessary to do X," or "only people can do X," or "people must do for people what they can't do for themselves." / Compare this to all the books containing lengthy chapters on why "the free market" is better at providing X (whatever) than "the government" is. Once you develop the ability to think in terms of individual human beings, it takes just two sentences to demolish all the arguments for "government." / This is a demonstration of the comparative power of individualistic thinking as opposed to collectivist thinking. / Unfortunately, for most people - including many freedom lovers - it seems impossible to grasp the above refutation because they are locked into the habit of thinking, talking, and writing about "government" as a volitional entity. They say "government does this and that" - as if "government" is some kind of living, breathing entity capable of performing actions - collectivist thinking. Sometimes it seems that when you say to these people, "Look at anything that "government" supposedly does, like running a school, and you'll find that all the work is being done by individual human beings," - individualist thinking - they can't hear you. They seem so brainwashed with the notion that "government does things," that their brains automatically shut out anything to the contrary. / We are dealing with a particular mental process here: when the mind is confronted with a thought that is dangerous to the way its knowledge has been organized hitherto, it tends to either "wipe out" the thought, or distort it into something more acceptable - as George Orwell wrote in Nineteen-Eighty-Four: "Crimestop means the faculty of stopping short, as though by instinct, at the threshold of any dangerous thought... crimestop, in short, means protective stupidity." / "Government" is a Scam, a Hoax, a Fraud, and a Swindle Nietzsche wrote that everything the state says is a lie. Of course, it's really individuals who lie when they call themselves "the state" or "the government." Throughout history, people have used all kinds of trickery to legitimize calling themselves "the King" or "the government" - for example, "the divine right of Kings to rule" and in "modern" days, "the Constitution." Some of this trickery is described in Build Freedom Report #TL06: Discourse on Voluntary Servitude. / The issue of the validity or legality of the so-called "Constitution" is covered in Report #TL07: The Constitution of No Authority. The essence of that report is that the so-called "Constitution" was never signed or adopted by anybody to make it a valid legal contract or agreement. That means that the so-called "U.S.A." has been a scam, hoax, fraud, and swindle from the outset. / It also means that all the politicians and bureaucrats, calling themselves "presidents," "secretaries," "judges," "generals," "congressmen," etc., have been liars and impostors masquerading as "government" (so-called). / The people who signed the pretended "U.S. Constitution," called themselves "We The People... " They were lying. They signed it as individuals. And they never signed it in any way to make it a binding contract. / It's a basic legal principle that for a contract to be valid, it needs to be knowingly, intentionally, and explicitly signed by all the parties involved. For something like a "U.S. Constitution" to be valid, it would have to be knowingly, intentionally, and explicitly signed by every single person involved. / On the same grounds, every political system in the world, I know of, is a fraud and a hoax. In his pamphlet, No Treason: The Constitution of No Authority, attorney (one of the good ones) Lysander Spooner wrote in 1870: / "The constitution has no inherent authority or obligation. It has no authority or obligation at all, unless as a contract between man and man. And it does not so much as even purport to be a contract between persons now existing. It purports at most, to be only a contract between persons living eighty years ago... we know, historically, that only a small portion of the people then existing were consulted on the subject, or asked, or permitted to express either their consent or dissent in any formal manner. Those people, if any, who did give their consent formally, are all dead now... and the constitution, so far as it was their contract, died with them. They had no natural power or right to make it obligatory upon their children... they did not even attempt to bind them. That is to say, the instrument does not purport to be an agreement between anybody but "the people" then existing; nor does it... assert any right, power, or disposition, on their part, to bind anybody but themselves... / The constitution itself, then, being of no authority, on what authority does our government practically rest? On what ground can those who pretend to administer it, claim the right to seize men's property, to restrain them in their natural liberty of action, industry and trade, and to kill all those who deny their authority to dispose of men's properties, liberties and lives at their pleasure or discretion?" [emphasis added] / Reading Spooner's pamphlet was an assault on my whole knowledge structure. It triggered a process of questioning many concepts such as "constitution" (so-called) - what does this word represent in reality? If Spooner was right, then it represented but an empty fraud. It also meant that words did not necessarily correspond with reality. There were "fraud-words" which served only to mislead. And if there is no valid "constitution," then what does the word "country" mean? What does it really represent? Similar questions followed about ''government," "state," "king," "law," etc. In the Introduction by James J. Martin to Spooner's No Treason, I read: / "Since late Neolithic times, men in their political capacity, have lived almost exclusively by myths [more appropriate: "fraudulent fabrications "or "murderous misrepresentations!"] And these political myths have continued to evolve, proliferate, and grow more complex and intricate, even though there has been a steady replacement of one by another over the centuries. A series of entirely theoretical constructs, sometimes mystical, usually deductive and speculative, they seek to explain the status and relationships in the community... / It is the assault upon the abstract and verbal underpinnings of this institution which draws blood, so to speak... those who attack the rationale of the game... are its most formidable adversaries." [emphasis added] / Spooner attacked words and phrases like "the government," "our country," "the United States," "member of congress," "King," "constitution of the United States," "nations", "the people," "emperor," "divine right," "president," "monarch," "ambassador," "national debt," "senator," "judge," etc. He indicated that these were all fraud-words designed to dupe the gullible. In a letter to Thomas F. Bayard, Spooner wrote: / "In practice, the constitution has been an utter fraud from the beginning. Professing to have been 'ordained and established' by we, the people of the United States, it has never been submitted to them, as individuals, for their voluntary acceptance... very few of them have ever read, or even seen it; or ever will read or see it. Of its legal meaning (if it can be said to have any) they really know nothing; and never did. Nor ever will know anything." / Spooner indicated that the people who masqueraded as the so-called "government" could be more accurately described as fraudulent impostors or a "secret band of thieves, robbers and murderers." Rick Maybury wrote as follows in an article, "Profiting from the Constitutional Convention," published in the November, 1984 issue of an investment newsletter, World Market Perspective: / "On March 10, 1783, at the town of Newburgh, New York, a group of generals met to plan a military coup. The generals offered the leadership to an officer the troops had respected and admired for many years... for several days the officer pondered whether or not he would accept the offer to become military dictator of America... finally, on March 15, 1783, he announced his decision to decline. His name was George Washington... / ... the First Constitutional Convention which commenced on May 14, 1787 had George Washington presiding. This is the convention that created our current constitution. The procedures and results of this convention have long been held to be legal, ethical, constitutional, patriotic and in every other way proper... it was held in secret. It had a hidden agenda. It was surrounded by clandestine meetings in which numerous deals were struck. The delegates intended to draw vast amounts of new power into the hands of the federal government and they violated every restriction their legislatures tried to impose on them. The First Constitutional Convention was actually a military coup. The history books do not describe it this way, but that is what it was... / It may have been the slickest, smoothest, most well-lubricated coup any nation has ever experienced. To this day, most Americans do not understand what was really done to them. They look back on it all and smile wistfully." / "Government Officials" as Compulsive Liars Is it possible to become a senior "government official" without being a compulsive liar? / "If you tell a big enough Lie, and keep on repeating it, in the end people will come to believe it." -- Josef Goebbels / "But the state lies in all languages of good and evil; and whatever it says, it lies - and whatever it has, it has stolen. Everything about it is false; it bites with stolen teeth. Even its belly is false." -- Friedrich Nietzsche / "In time of war, the truth is so precious it must be attended by a bodyguard of lies." -- Winston Churchill / If you do a Google.com search for "government lies" you'll get about 5,000 results. A Google search for +government +"big lie" yields over 14,000 results. / Is there anything "government officials" don't lie about? Someone should make a list of major issues and then research what lies "government officials" have been telling about those issues. I would be surprised if there is even one major issue they don't routinely lie about. / See also "Automatic Lying: The Hallmark of Professional Value Destroyers." / "Government" as Economic Rape and Value Destruction The "legal plunder" aspect of "government" has been pointed out above under "Government" as "Legal Plunder," with a reference to 'The Economic Rape of America.' / Neo-Tech includes the important distinction between value producers or value creators on the one hand, and value detroyers on the other. To fully grasp this distinction and its wide-ranging implications, I recommend perusal of the "Neo-Tech Advantages" and "War of Two Worlds: Value Producers versus Value Destroyers.". / 'The State' by Franz Oppenheimer is a classic on the origin and development of "the state" (and "government"). As far as I know, Oppenheimer was the first to make the distinction between the economic means to survival versus the political means -- a distinction closely related to Neo-Tech's distinction between value producers and value destroyers. / "The State, completely in its genesis, essentially and almost completely during the first stages of its existence, is a social institution, forced by a victorious group of men on a defeated group, with the sole purpose of regulating the dominion of the victorious group over the vanquished, and securing itself against revolt from within and attacks from abroad. Teleologically, this dominion had no other purpose than the economic exploitation of the vanquished by the victors." -- Franz Oppenheimer ('The State') / "Taking the State wherever found, striking into its history at any point, one sees no way to differentiate the activities of its founders, administrators, and beneficiaries from those of a professional-criminal class." -- Albert Jay Nock / This also applies to the "American Fleecing Fathers" -- see #TL070: The "Constitutional Delusion." / "A close examination of history indicates that only a coercive theory can account for the rise of the state. Force, and not enlightened self-interest, is the mechanism by which political evolution has led, step by step, from autonomous villages to the state... No primitive state known to history originated in any other manner. ...Everywhere we find some warlike tribe of wild men breaking through the boundaries of some less warlike people, settling down as nobility and founding the State." -- Franz Oppenheimer ('The State') / "The moment when the first conqueror spared his victim in order to exploit him in productive work, was of incomparable historical importance. It gave birth to nation and state, to right and the higher economics, with all the developments and ramifications which have grown which will hereafter grow out of them." -- Franz Oppenheimer ('The State') / "Government" is a Theatrical Tragicomedy My Webster's defines tragicomedy as "a drama or a situation blending tragic and comic elements." The theme that "government" is theater is expounded by Ferdinand Mount's excellent book The Theater of Politics - in the Introduction Max Lerner writes, "politics is shot through with the theatric, and can be understood best only if we view the exchange between political actor and political audience as theater... the element of theater on the American scene has gone beyond politics and pervaded the entire society. It has become history-as-theater." / Let me suggest that when you watch TV, listen to the radio, or read the newspaper and the topic is politics, either people are getting hurt or killed (tragedy), or some political actor is openly joking or pretending to be serious (comedy). Alexis de Tocqueville in his Recollections wrote about the 1848 French Revolution: / "The whole time I had the feeling that we had staged a play about the French Revolution... Though I foresaw the terrible end to the piece well enough, I could not take the actors very seriously; the whole thing seemed a vile tragedy played by a provincial troupe." / Some quotes from Mount's The Theater of Politics follow: / \* "... [T]he political confidence trick, whether monarchic or presidential, oligarchic or democratic, whether necessary or unnecessary, is at any rate effective, because most people are foolish and gullible." / \* "Is political history the record of a mass of mugs being taken for a series of rides?" / \* "We see the politician rather as an actor who takes on a part; and we judge him according to whether he plays well or badly." / \* "The theory is comforting: they are our hired servants. The practice is humiliating; we are their wayward wards, to be comforted, cajoled, bullied, but never to be treated as equals, never to be told more of the truth than suits their present purposes, and too often to be told off-white lies." / \* "He [Churchill] is, as all political actors must be, the analyst of humbug, the humbugger and the humbugged all in one." / \* From Edmund Burke's Reflections on the French Revolution, describing political rhetoric: "... a theatrical, bombastick, windy phraseology of heroick virtue, blended and mingled up with a worse dissoluteness, and joined to a murderous and savage ferocity, forms the tone and idiom of their language and their manners... Statesmen, like your present rulers, exist by everything which is spurious, fictitious, and false; by everything which takes the man from his house, and sets him in a stage, which makes him up an artificial creature, with painted theatrick sentiments, fit to be seen by the glare of candle-light, and formed to be contemplated at a due distance... If the system of institution recommended by the assembly is false and theatrick it is because their system of government is of the same character." / Words Have Consequences Of course, words in themselves don't have consequences, but whenever a word is used, there are consequences. When you talk to a person, depending on the words you use, that person may become happy, sad, or angry. Words have consequences. / If words have consequences, then it's obvious that different words have different consequences. It's also obvious that we can observe the consequences of the words we use. We can become aware of the consequences. We can experiment and learn to use different words to produce different consequences. / Also note that when the politicians and bureaucrats want your money, they don't immediately point their guns at you. They send you words on paper or by phone. In general, they only come after you with their guns if you repeatedly don't give them money. Because most people obey the words of politicians and bureaucrats, they don't have to use their guns all that often. / In Build Freedom we talk a lot about Freedom Technology: the practical knowledge, methods, and skills to live free. A major aspect of Freedom Technology is to learn how to use the right words to counter the words of the politicians and bureaucrats, and to escape having to give them money - without being jailed or shot. / Let me suggest to you that the destructive power of the politician, the bureaucrat, and the lawyer stems much more from their words than from their guns... Take away their words, and what happens? How can we take away their words? / Self-Referencing Syntax In order to grasp the nature of "government" (so-called), it may be necessary to master certain thinking skills that enable you to handle self-referencing syntax. English - and probably languages in general - isn't particularly suited for handling self-referencing. / Consider the sentence: "government" consists of individual human beings. The reason the word "government" is in quotation marks may indicate that the author questions the validity of the term. To emphasize the challenge to the validity of the term or concept "government," the author may say: so-called "government." / When I say - So-called "government" consists of individual human beings - the sentence includes self-referencing syntax. The sentence says that part of itself is invalid - the concept of "government." / There is also a problem with the use of "quotation marks." They are used for at least a dozen different purposes. The reader has to figure out from the context for what purpose quotation marks are being used. In his book How To Read A Page, I.A. Richard wrote: / "We all recognize - more or less unsystematically - that quotation marks serve varied purposes: / 1. Sometimes they show merely that we are quoting and where our quotation begins and ends. / / 2. Sometimes they imply that the words within them are in some way open to question and are only to be taken in some special sense with reference to some special definition. / / 3. Sometimes they suggest further that what is quoted is nonsense or that there is really no such thing as the thing they profess to name. / / 4. Sometimes they suggest that the words are improperly used. The quotation marks are equivalent to 'the so-called.' / / 5. Sometimes they only indicate that we are talking of the words as distinguished from their meanings... / / 6. There are many other uses... " / Questioning Words or Concepts Most people take it for granted that there is some kind of one-to-one relationship between words and the things represented by those words. They assume that because practically everybody uses a word like "government," therefore there's such a thing as "government." / In order to develop an accurate description of the "nature of government," it's absolutely vital to make a distinction between the word and the thing it supposedly represents. The word is a noise that comes out of your mouth (or some squiggles on paper). The thing is something you can touch or feel - or discern otherwise. This is why semanticists are fond of saying, "Whatever you say something is, it's not that." You see, the thing is what it is - and what you say it is, is a noise coming out your mouth. / Just because we use the word "government" doesn't automatically mean there's a thing "government." For the previous sentence to make any sense to you, you must be able to question words or concepts. You must be able to recognize that "government" is an abstract concept. In contrast, "table" could be called a "concrete concept" - even though the concept "table" is an abstraction of the thing "table." There's a word in my Webster's for construing (regarding) a conceptual entity as a real existent: hypostatization. / I speculate that for most people their consciousness is rooted in a number of basic concepts, and that "government" is one of these basic concepts. When their "government" concept is challenged it's as if their entire consciousness is threatened and they run a mile. / Later I'll refer to "statist fraud words." Some years ago I had dinner with a libertarian intellectual friend in the Atomium Restaurant in Brussels. We had an extensive discussion about libertarianism. Every time he used a statist fraud word such as "government," "country," "nation," "prime minister," "law," etc., I challenged that word. I asked him what he meant by it. I asked him for a referent. (The referent is the thing the word refers to. In the case of "table," it's the physical object with a flat top and four legs.) After about 20 minutes of my onslaught, my friend became sick and had to run to the restroom to puke his guts out! He blamed me. I speculate that challenging people's basic concepts may threaten, not only their consciousness, but also their metabolism! / Two Tribes Consider two different isolated tribes somewhere in the jungles of South America. Call them Tribe 1 and Tribe 2. Each has its unique language with its own structure. The language of tribe 1 (language 1) tends to be very literal. A man who fishes, for example, is called "man-who-fishes." The same man, while sleeping, is called "man-who-sleeps"; while talking, "man-who-talks"; while running, -"man-who-runs"; while eating, man-who-eats"; while writing, "man-who-writes"; while making a chair, "man-who-makes-chair"; while giving orders, "man-who-gives-orders"; etc. In language 1, distinctions are made between different kinds of words: "Thing-words," "Do-words," "How-words," "Story-words," "Funny-words," "order-words," "Panic-words," "What-words," "Who-words," "Why-words," "When-words," "Where-words," etc. Abstractions are rare in language 1. To the people of tribe 1, any word that doesn't refer to something physically perceivable, is highly suspect. Their test for reality is physical. / The language of Tribe 2 (Language 2) is very different. A man who obtains his wherewithal mostly by fishing, is called "fisherman." (This system of nomenclature would seem absurd to the people of Tribe 1 - how can you call someone a "fisherman" when he is not fishing, but sleeping?) Language 2 contains many abstractions - like "happiness." People from Tribe 2 can talk for hours about "happiness." (To someone from Tribe 1, this would be incomprehensible - they only talk about "woman-who-is-happy" while she is happy, and "woman-who-is-sad" while she is sad. The notion that you could separate "happiness" from a real person being happy, and talk about "happiness" as if it existed by itself, would be completely unthinkable to someone from Tribe 1.) / To the people from Tribe 2, any word being used is automatically assumed to be part of existence, otherwise people wouldn't use it. (To someone from Tribe 1, the word "existence" would be a meaningless absurdity, because in their mentality only particular objects exist.) In Tribe 2, the test for reality is agreement. If other people agree with a word and the way it seems to be used, then that word is automatically accepted as valid and useful. They suffer from hypostatization. / One day a strange man arrives at the place where the people of Tribe 1 live. They ask him: "Who you?" He: "I King". They: "your name King?". He: "No; my name John." They: "Why call self King if name John?" He: "I special person, agent of God." They: "You look different but not special; who God?" He: "God creator of world." They: "Where God?; How create world?" He: "God everywhere; God all-powerful." They: "How we see God?" He: "Can't see God." They: "You speak crazy." He: "No; I special; I show you." Whereupon the stranger performs various tricks like apparently making objects appear and disappear. They: "You clever man-who tricks." He: "I special; I King." They: "You speak funny; you clever John-who-tricks." He: "I King; my word law." They: "What law? - special word?" He: "Yes; my word law - you must obey." They: "Ah! You mean order-word!" He: "Yes; I King; I make law." They: "No; you speak order-word?" He: "Yes; I special". They: "What special? - Anybody speak order-word?" He: "You not understand." They: "No." / Eventually John-the-stranger gives up trying to convince the people of Tribe 1 that he has a "special status" and that his words are different from the words of anyone else - so he leaves, to search for more gullible and impressionable victims elsewhere... / For many days and nights he trudges through the jungle before discovering the people of Tribe 2. They: "Who you?" He: "I King." They: "Your name King?" He: "No, my name John." They: "Why call self King if name John?" He: "I special person, agent of God." They: "You look different; what God?" He: "God creator of world." They: Where God?; How create world?" He "God everywhere; God all-powerful." They: "Show special?" Whereupon the stranger performs various tricks like apparently making objects appear and disappear. They: "You King, agent of God." He: "Yes, my word law." They: "What law?" He: "Law special word of God through me; you must obey." Whereupon the people of Tribe 2 bow down and kiss the feet of John - they do not habitually test abstractions against reality, so they readily accept John-the-stranger as their "King" and his word as "law." Thereafter all he has to do to control and dominate them, is to open his mouth... / "Government" is a Form of Parasitism or Cannibalism The reason why people call themselves "government" is because it provides them with advantages - if they can get away with it. In the case of tribe 1, John-the-stranger called himself "King," but the people didn't buy it, so he left. However, the gullible people from tribe 2 believed him, so they became his "subjects" - meaning he could live off their effort - like a parasite. / The "state" (so-called) has its origin in a gang of looters making an agreement with a tribe: "We'll protect you from other gangs if you give us part of the food you produce." ("Government" is a Mafia-like protection racket.) / It's much easier to live off the values produced by others than to create your own values. Being a parasite is easier than being a producer. Being a value destroyer is easier than being a value creator. Now if we take it a step further, and regard the fruit of our labor as part of ourselves, then we're talking about cannibalism. That's why the American Declaration of Independence talks about "eating out our substance." "Government" is a form of cannibalism. / "Government" is also a form of "self-cannibalism." It continuously eats out its own substance, eventually destroying itself. It may start off only moderately destructive - like after the American Revolution - but gradually (but sometimes with big jumps) it becomes monstrously degenerate and destructive - like in modern America. / See also the earlier section on "Government" as "Legal Plunder." In this context it may be worth examining the role of lawyers -- see THE WORST PROFESSIONAL SCREWMASTERS. For the roles of bankers, tax collectors, etc., see the rest of THE ECONOMIC RAPE OF AMERICA. / In the Grandfarther Economic Report, Michael Hodges identifies "Five Core Threats" to the USA: / 1. Government dominance of the economy; / / 2. Declining quality of education; / / 3. Increasing debt dependence; / / 4. Growing international indebtedness; / / 5. Growing dependence on foreign oil. / Here are some of his findings: # Federal spending has been growing EIGHT times faster than the economy. # State and local government has been growing 2-3 times faster than the economy. # In the year 2000, complying with government regulation cost $977 billion -- 13% of the economy. # Recent claims of government surpluses are false. # The so-called social security and medicare "trust funds" contain no funds. The money is spent as it comes in and is replaced by "government IOUs to itself." / "Government" is Kept in Place by Certain Fraud-Words Politicians and bureaucrats use mostly words to impose their will upon others - even when physical violence is involved, they use words to attempt to justify their actions.

#### This turns the case. Replacing “government” with “terrocrat” avoids the link.

Frederick Mann, B.A., Communications @ Sanford University; Founder, Terra Libra, 1998, “‘The Nature of Government’.”

"But to tear down a factory or to revolt against a government... is to attack effects rather than causes; and as long as the attack is upon effects only, *no change is possible.* The true system, the real system, is our present construction of systematic thought itself, rationality itself. And if a factory is torn down but the rationality which produced it is left standing, then that rationality will simply produce another factory. If a revolution destroys a systematic government, but the systematic patterns of thought that produced that government are left intact, then those patterns will repeat themselves in the succeeding government..." [emphasis added] / Frank Herbert illustrates the same principle in his book The White Plague: "There's a lust for power in the Irish as there is in every people, a lusting after the ascendancy where you can tell others how to behave. It has a peculiar shape with the Irish, though. It comes of having lost our ancient ways - the simpler laws, the rath and the family at the core of society. Romanized governments dismay us. They always resolve themselves into widely separated ascendants and subjects, the latter being more numerous than the former, of course. Sometimes it's done with great subtlety as it was in America, the slow accumulations of power, law upon law and all of it manipulated by an elite whose monopoly it is to understand the private language of injustice. Do not blame the ascendants. Such separation requires docile subjects as well. This may be the lot of any government, Marxist Russians included. There's a peculiar human susceptibility you see when you look at the Soviets, them building an almost exact copy of the Czarist regimes, the same paranoia, the same secret police, the same untouchable military, and the murder squads, the Siberian death camps, the lid of terror on creative imagination, deportation of the ones who cannot be killed off or bought off. It's like some terrible plastic memory sitting there in the dark of our minds, ready on the instant to reshape itself into primitive patterns the moment the heat touches it." [emphasis added] / Let me suggest to you that *the "terrible plastic memory" consists of concepts like "government,"* "state," "nation," "king," "president," "law," etc. The tragedy of organizing human affairs into structures called "government" will be resolved when the underlying structures of words, and the thoughts that stem from the words, are changed. In The Virtue of Selfishness Ayn Rand wrote: / "If some men do not choose to think, but survive by imitating and repeating, like trained animals, the routine sounds and motions they learned from others, never making an effort to understand... they are the men who march into the abyss, trailing after any destroyer who promises them to assume the responsibility they evade: the responsibility of being conscious." / "Government" is Kept in Place by Brainwashing My book Wake Up America! The Dynamics of Human Power includes a chapter titled "Are our Schools Concentration Campuses for Mind Destruction?" in which I describe "education" in some detail. / Ayn Rand's The New Left: The Anti-Industrial Revolution, contains a chapter, "The Comprachicos." Comprachico is a Spanish word meaning "child-buyer." The comprachicos were a nomadic association, notorious in the seventeenth century. They bought and sold children - special children, children turned into deformed freaks, used in freak shows to amuse the public. At an early age they placed a young child in a porcelain pot with a grotesque form. As the child's body grew, it had to assume the shape of the pot. The result was a deformed freak for people to laugh at. / Rand uses the practice of the comprachicos as an analogy to describe American "education." She refers to our "educators" as "the comprachicos of the mind." Children's minds are forced to assume the shape of a grotesque "intellectual pot." Rand describes the result: / "The students' development is arrested, their minds are set to respond to slogans, as animals respond to a trainer's whistle, their brains are embalmed in the syrup of altruism as an automatic substitute for self-esteem... They would obey anyone, they need a master, they need to be told what to do. They are ready now to be used as cannon fodder - to attack, to bomb, to burn, to murder, to fight in the streets and die in the gutters. They are a trained pack of miserably impotent freaks, ready to be unleashed against anyone." [emphasis added] / In every part of the world, the monsters who masquerade as "government," do their utmost to achieve monopoly control of the so-called "education system" - they try to make it compulsory so all children will be subjected to government brainwashing. The result is that practically every victim is degraded into an unthinking follower... or unthinking rebel. / "Government" is Kept in Place by Mass Hallucination My Webster's definition of hallucination includes the following: / \* Perception of objects with no reality; / \* A completely unfounded or mistaken impression or notion. / We could also describe hallucination as "seeing" or "perceiving" what's not there - or "seeing" or "perceiving" more than exists in reality. / Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP) could be described as the science of representational systems. In our brains we have "neural patterns" or "models" that attempt to represent reality. For example, in my brain I have a "picture" of a table. If someone asks me to draw a picture of a table, I access the "picture" or "model" in my head, from which I then draw a table. These "pictures," "models," or "neural patterns" are called representational systems. They include intellectual, emotional, visual, auditory, and other sensory data. / Our representational systems are more or less "useful." To the extent that we use them to predict accurately and produce desirable results, we regard them as useful. NLP people have identified three major ways in which our representational systems differ >>>from reality: / \* Generalization - e.g., the representational system called "furniture" - or the "intellectual" neural pattern: "all women are the same." / \* Distortion - e.g., "the color of my car is blue" - the physicist tells us this is a distortion; it's more accurate to say that my car's outer surface reflects light with the wavelength we call "blue," while absorbing light with other wavelengths. / \* Deletion - e.g., "Tom is a wonderful, generous, happy, healthy individual" - Tom has many other attributes, some of which have been ignored or "deleted" from my representational system. / \* I've identified a very important fourth way in which our representational systems differ from reality: / \* Addition - e.g., "John-the-stranger is a King, therefore he has special powers; and the words that come out of his mouth are special and therefore are the law which must be obeyed." John is really an ordinary man. By representing him as a "King" in our representational systems, we have added something to what exists in reality. Similarly, John's words are ordinary like those of the rest of us, and when we represent some of his words as "the law" in our representational systems, we have added something to what occurs in reality. / The essence of hallucination is "seeing" or "perceiving" what doesn't really exist or occur. The phenomenon of addition, as described above, is simply hallucination. To have a neural patterns or mental models that say "the government runs the country," "government makes law," "Slick Willy is President of the U.S.A.," all constitute hallucination. / It's these forms of hallucination that keep "government" in place. Because practically all humans suffer from similar political hallucinations, they tend to all agree with each other about certain fundamental political concepts and notions - such as "government," "state," "country," "nation," "constitution," "king," "president," "law," etc. If anybody questions or challenges these concepts or notions, they tend to think he's crazy. The phenomenon is mass hallucination. / Here is one of my favorite sentences: "The notion of "law" (so-called) is an hallawcinotion" - it sounds even better in French: "La notion de la "loi" (soi-disant) est une halloicinotion." How's that for self-referencing?! / "Government" is Kept in Place by Terror and by Violence Ultimately, political power comes from the barrel of the gun - as Mao said. The last resort of the monsters who masquerade as "government" is terror and violence. That's why they need the IRS, the ATF, the FBI, the CIA, etc. They have to threaten, terrorize, punish, and kill to retain their coercive power. Make examples out of those who question, threaten, or challenge their so-called "authority." / That's why it's appropriate to call them "territorial gangsters" or "territorial criminals" or "terrocrats" - monsters who use fraud, coercion, and violence to claim "jurisdiction" over a certain area, and the people who happen to be in that area. The monsters do so in order to control and dominate, and to live like parasites or cannibals off the values created by their victims. The foregoing is another very useful definition of "government!"

### Turtles Conditions CP

#### [CP TEXT: The United States federal government ought not invest in seawater irrigation in Mexican deserts unless Mexico adopts and enforces legislation for sea turtle conservation abiding by standards outlined in the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna.]

#### The US should condition engagement and threaten sanctions based on Mexican adoption of international sea turtle conservation standards; similar policies towards Mexico empirically solve for protection of marine biodiversity.

Edith Brown Weiss1, John Howard Jackson2 and Nathalie Bernasconi-Osterwalder3, 4-30-2008, Francis Cabell Brown Professor of International Law @ Georgetown, A.B., Stanford; J.D., Harvard; Ph.D., University of California, Berkeley; LL.D.(Hon.), Chicago-Kent; LL.D. (Hon.), University of Heidelberg1, Director; Institute of International Economic Law, University Professor @ Georgetown, A.B., Princeton; J.D., University of Michigan; LL.D. (Hon.), Hamburg University, Germany; LL.D. (Hon.), European University Institute, Florence, Italy2, a senior international lawyer and heads the Investment Program of the International Institute on Sustainable Development (IISD)3, “Reconciling Environment and Trade,” http://books.google.com/books?id=PeTVvZW7JRoC&dq=Sea+Turtles+MExico+Sanctions&source=gbs\_navlinks\_s

Several international agreements upon which a similar treaty for the sea turtles could be based exist. These international agreements include CITES and the Convention on Biodiversity. Using CITES is an obvious choice because sea turtles are listed in both Appendices I and II of CITES, demonstrating the recognition by its signatories that sea turtles are endangered and need to be protected. In the Shrimp-Turtle case, the United States could select an agreement that all parties to the dispute have signed, and use it as a foundation for a more expansive treaty. However, the question remains whether or not this kind of agreement, enforced through trade sanctions, would be GATT compliant. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE This Case Does Not Provide the United States with Guidance in Avoiding Future Conflict Between Its Domestic Court System and the WTO Despite the shortcomings of negotiated solutions, in this case a nego-tiated solution could enable the United States to satisfy the requirements of both the WTO and the CIT. If the complainants agreed to comply vol-untarily with the requirements under Section 609 by implementing tur-tle-safe harvesting methods in exchange for U.S. technical assistance, the United States would be able to comply with the mandate of CIT. A negotiated solution in this case, however, does not offer the United States a predictable model to follow in potential future conflicts. The lack of guidance for future cases will further muddle the U.S. analysis of avail-able tools for environmental protection. In the United States, similar con-flicts between national laws (like Section 609) and the mandates of a multinational organization (WTO) will likely increase as the government views environmental protection as an important area. For example, 143 After the Tuna-Dolphin opinion, the parties, through the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), established in 1949, negotiated a dolphin accord, the International Dolphin Conservation Act (IDCA) of 1992. The IDCA lifted the tuna import ban against Mexico and Venezuela but provided for unilateral trade sanc-tions if they failed to comply with the moratorium. The Declaration of Panama was signed on October 4, 1995, giving multinational effect to the IDCA. Finally, on August 15, 1997, the U.S. Congress amended the Marine Mammal Protection Act to recognize the IDCA and to lift the ban on tuna imports from signatories of the Declaration of Panama. See Cadeddu, supra note 53.

#### Conditioning economic engagement with Mexico on adoption of sea turtle protection policy prevents population extinction.

Center for Biological Diversity, 7-15-2013, a nonprofit membership organization known for its work protecting endangered species through legal action and scientific petitions, “Tell Mexico: Stop Killing Endangered Sea Turtles,” http://action.biologicaldiversity.org/o/2167/p/dia/action3/common/public/?action\_KEY=13749

Each year at least 2,000 endangered loggerhead sea turtles are caught by shark and halibut fishermen off the southern peninsula of Mexico's Baja California. The turtles drown after being accidentally hooked on longline gear or entangled in gillnets; then they're thrown back into the sea, only to wash up dead on shore. Sea turtle deaths reached record levels last year, and alarmingly high stranding rates continued this spring. Scientists and conservationists have urged Mexico to close fishing areas where sea turtle habitat and risky gear overlap -- but Mexico has failed to take action. The United States and Mexico share this loggerhead sea turtle population, which is listed as endangered in both countries. Please, act now using the form below. Tell Mexico you're fed up with its bycatch and that you support U.S. trade sanctions if Mexico doesn't step up and stop the killing. Stop the Bycatch of Loggerhead Sea Turtles I am writing to ask Mexico to act now and halt the ongoing loggerhead sea turtle bycatch off Baja California Sur. As you know, for two decades scientists have documented turtles becoming hooked or entangled in the Gulf of Ulloa's longline and gillnet fisheries. These fisheries kill an estimated 2,000 loggerheads each year. Last July 483 loggerheads were found stranded on just one stretch of beach -- a 600 percent increase over previous years' averages. And alarmingly high stranding rates have continued this spring. The United States and Mexico share the North Pacific loggerhead sea turtle population, which is listed as endangered in both countries. The United States has closed fishing areas where important sea turtle habitat and risky gear overlap and also requires its fishermen to adopt more sea turtle-friendly gear. Mexico can and must do the same -- or risk the population's extinction. If Mexico does not act, I fully support U.S. trade sanctions until Mexico reduces sea turtle mortality and adopts "comparable" turtle protection measures, as required by international treaty and U.S. law. Sea turtles need protection on both sides of the border, and I urge Mexico to act now to save these ancient and vanishing animals.

#### Destruction of the sea turtle population causes extinction – brink is now.

Todd Steiner, xx-xx-2010, Sea Turtle Restoration Project, Executive Director at Turtle Island Restoration Network, San Francisco Bay Area, “Are Sea Turtles Worth Saving?” http://www.bonaireturtles.org/explore/are-sea-turtles-worth-saving/

Sea turtles demonstrate the ultimate lesson of ecology – that everything is connected. Sea turtles are part of two vital ecosystems, beaches and marine systems. If sea turtles become extinct, both the marine and beach ecosystems will weaken. And since humans use the ocean as an important source for food and use beaches for many kinds of activities, weakness in these ecosystems would have harmful effects on humans. Though sea turtles have been living and thriving in the world’s oceans for 150 million years, they are now in danger of extinction largely because of changes brought about by humans. If we alter the oceans and beaches enough to wipe out sea turtles, will those changes make it difficult for us to survive? And if we choose to do what’s necessary to save sea turtles, might we save our own future? Beaches and dune systems do not get very many nutrients during the year, so very little vegetation grows on the dunes and no vegetation grows on the beach itself. This is because sand does not hold nutrients very well. Sea turtles use beaches and the lower dunes to nest and lay their eggs. Sea turtles lay around 100 eggs in a nest and lay between 3 and 7 nests during the summer nesting season. Not every nest will hatch, not every egg in a nest will hatch, and not all of the hatchlings in a nest will make it out of the nest. All the unhatched nests, eggs and trapped hatchlings are very good sources of nutrients for the dune vegetation. Even the left-over egg shells from hatched eggs provide nutrients. Dune plants use the nutrients from turtle eggs to grow and become stronger. As the dune vegetation grows stronger and healthier, the health of the entire beach/dune ecosystem becomes better. Healthy vegetation and strong root systems hold the sand in the dunes and protect the beach from erosion. As the number of turtles declines, fewer eggs are laid in the beaches, providing less nutrients. If sea turtles went extinct, dune vegetation would lose a major source of nutrients and would not be healthy or strong enough to maintain the dunes, allowing beaches to wash away. Sea turtles eat jellyfish, preventing the large “blooms” of jellyfish – including stinging jellyfish – that are increasingly wreaking havoc on fisheries, recreation and other maritime activities throughout the oceans. Research has shown that sea turtles often act as keystone species. Sea grass beds grazed by green sea turtles are more productive than those that aren’t. Hawksbill turtles eat sponges, preventing them from out-competing slow-growing corals. Both of these grazing activities maintain species diversity and the natural balance of fragile marine ecosystems. If sea turtles go extinct, it will cause declines in all the species whose survival depends on healthy seagrass beds and coral reefs. That means that many marine species that humans harvest would be lost. Sea turtles, and many species that are affected by their presence or absence, are an important attraction for marine tourism, a major source of income for many countries. These are some of the roles that we know sea turtles play in the essential health of ecosystems. Who knows what other roles we will discover as science reveals more about sea turtles? While humans have the ability to tinker with the “clockwork” of life, we don’t have the ability to know when it’s okay to lose a few of the working parts. If you disagree, try to take apart a clock and just throw away one of the pieces that doesn’t look that important. Put the clock back together and see if it still works.

### Irrigation Pipelines DA

#### Plan requires building of ocean pipelines

Glenn, Brown, O’Leary—1AC author—98 Edward P Glenn, PhD in botanical science University of Hawaii and professor of wildlife and fisheries science at University of Arizona, Jed Brown, at the Laboratory for Advanced Numerical Simulation at the Argonne National Laboratory, Mathematics and Computer Science and a PhD from the University of Arizona’s wildlife and fisheries program, James W O’Leary, professor of plant sciences at the University of Arizona, “Irrigating Crops with Seawater” August 1998, http://www.miracosta.edu/home/kmeldahl/articles/crops.pdf es

Can seawater agriculture be economical? The greatest expense in irrigated agriculture is in pumping the water. The pumping costs are directly proportional to the amount of water pumped and the height to which it is lifted. Although halophytes require more water than conventional crops, seawater farms near sea level require less water lifting than conventional farms, which often lift water from wells deeper than 100 meters. Because pumping seawater at sea level is cheaper than pumping freshwater from wells, seawater agriculture should be cost-effective in desert regions—even though its yields are smaller than traditional, freshwater agriculture. Seawater irrigation does not require special equipment. The large test farms we have helped build have used either ﬂood irrigation of large basins or moving-boom sprinkler irrigation. Moving booms are used in many types of crop production. For seawater use, a plastic pipe is inserted in the boom so the seawater does not contact metal. Salicornia seeds have also been successfully harvested using ordinary combines set to maximize retention of the very small seeds, which are only roughly one milligram in weight.

#### Marine pipelines are bad—cause inevitable corrosion and leaks which collapse marine biodiversity.

**DSPComm**, 20**09** (one of the fastest growing companies in the underwater wireless modem market, “Subsea pipeline Monitoring,” http://www.dspcomm.com/applications\_monitoring.html >:)

Subsea pipeline monitoring In subsea oil and gas production fields, pipelines are an integral part of transporting the hydrocarbons to downstream processes. Problems arise in these pipelines because of corrosion, structural failure and sludge formation due to hydrocarbon chemical processes. These sorts of problems lead to production and revenue loss, as well as high maintenance costs. Furthermore today's environmental concerns govern that hydrocarbon leaks into the ocean be avoided to prevent ecological disasters. Minimising these problems by forecasting and timely action is of vital interest to the industry. Constant pipeline monitoring provides the data necessary to make the correct decisions. In pipeline monitoring, sensors are placed along the pipeline to collect data that can be reticulated to the surface.

#### Ocean collapse causes extinction.

**Craig**, 20**03**, Associate Professor of Law, Indiana U School Law, McGeorge Law Review, 34 McGeorge L. Rev. 155 Lexis

Biodiversity and ecosystem function arguments for conserving marine ecosystems also exist, just as they do for terrestrial ecosystems, but these arguments have thus far rarely been raised in political debates. For example, besides significant tourism values - the most economically valuable ecosystem service coral reefs provide, worldwide - coral reefs protect against storms and dampen other environmental fluctuations, services worth more than ten times the reefs' value for food production. n856 Waste treatment is another significant, non-extractive ecosystem function that intact coral reef ecosystems provide. n857 More generally, "ocean ecosystems play a major role in the global geochemical cycling of all the elements that represent the basic building blocks of living organisms, carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, phosphorus, and sulfur, as well as other less abundant but necessary elements." n858 In a very real and direct sense, therefore, human degradation of marine ecosystems impairs the planet's ability to support life. Maintaining biodiversity is often critical to maintaining the functions of marine ecosystems. Current evidence shows that, in general, an ecosystem's ability to keep functioning in the face of disturbance is strongly dependent on its biodiversity, "indicating that more diverse ecosystems are more stable." n859 Coral reef ecosystems are particularly dependent on their biodiversity.  [\*265]   Most ecologists agree that the complexity of interactions and degree of interrelatedness among component species is higher on coral reefs than in any other marine environment. This implies that the ecosystem functioning that produces the most highly valued components is also complex and that many otherwise insignificant species have strong effects on sustaining the rest of the reef system. n860 Thus, maintaining and restoring the biodiversity of marine ecosystems is critical to maintaining and restoring the ecosystem services that they provide. Non-use biodiversity values for marine ecosystems have been calculated in the wake of marine disasters, like the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska. n861 Similar calculations could derive preservation values for marine wilderness. However, economic value, or economic value equivalents, should not be "the sole or even primary justification for conservation of ocean ecosystems. Ethical arguments also have considerable force and merit." n862 At the forefront of such arguments should be a recognition of how little we know about the sea - and about the actual effect of human activities on marine ecosystems. The United States has traditionally failed to protect marine ecosystems because it was difficult to detect anthropogenic harm to the oceans, but we now know that such harm is occurring - even though we are not completely sure about causation or about how to fix every problem. Ecosystems like the NWHI coral reef ecosystem should inspire lawmakers and policymakers to admit that most of the time we really do not know what we are doing to the sea and hence should be preserving marine wilderness whenever we can - especially when the United States has within its territory relatively pristine marine ecosystems that may be unique in the world. We may not know much about the sea, but we do know this much: if we kill the ocean we kill ourselves, and we will take most of the biosphere with us.

### Advantage CP

#### [CP TEXT: The United States federal government should substantially increase its agricultural exports towards Mexico, including but not limited to deserts in Mexico. The United States federal government should substantially increase its remittance and housing cooperation with Mexico.]

#### Housing and remittances solves job creation and poverty

Rieff, 2011 (David, Senior Fellow at the World Policy Institute at the New School for Social Research, a Fellow at the New York Institute for the Humanities at New York University, and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, 3/17/11, “The Struggle for Mexico,” [http://www.newrepublic.com/article/world/magazine/85337/mexico-calderon-clinton-obama-drug-cartels#](http://www.newrepublic.com/article/world/magazine/85337/mexico-calderon-clinton-obama-drug-cartels))

On the economic side, while Mexico remains heavily dependent on the remittances of the millions of immigrants now working, legally or illegally, in the United States, the country also has a rising middle class. It is common to associate the Mexican economy with Pemex, the state oil company, which the government has tended to loot—in the process, depleting oil revenue that should have been put to work on modernization of drilling infrastructure, particularly offshore, which, if Mexico is to continue as a major petroleum exporter, is where it must hunt for new resources. (The contrast with the much better-run, state-controlled Brazilian oil giant, Petrobras, or Malaysia’s Petronas, is painful.) But, increasingly, there is also the Mexico of Homex, a company started in Sinaloa in 1989. Homex is now one of the leading global firms involved in the building of low- and middleincome housing, with large operations in Brazil and India as well as in 20 Mexican states. And yet, the only thing most non-Mexicans who are drawn to the failed-state hypothesis seem to know about Sinaloa is that it gave its name to a powerful drug cartel. If one takes the long view, the clash between the Mexico of Pemex and the Mexico of Homex may be as important as the war between the cartels and the government. And, unless the Mexican economy implodes, which is highly unlikely, there is an excellent chance that the Mexico of Homex will prevail. In any case, it is a contest in which the narco-traffickers—even narco-traffickers operating right alongside the Homexes of Mexico—do not now have, and will never have, a say.

## Hunger

### Hunger

#### Movements against neoliberalism are growing and strong in Latin America and spill over globally---but the plans insistence on US led economic cooperation and integration reifies neoliberalism’s hegemonic grasp---instead of economic engagement, there must be a de-linking to preserve the environment and indigenous culture’s survival.

Harris 8 (Richard L Harris: Professor of Global Studies at California State University, Monterey Bay; Managing Editor of the Journal of Developing Societies (SAGE India); and Coordi­ nating Editor of Latin American Perspectives (SAGE USA). “Latin America’s Response to Neoliberalism and Globalization,” http://www.nuso.org/upload/articulos/3506\_2.pdf)

The economic, political and social development of the Latin American and Caribbean countries is obstructed by the power relations and international structures that regulate the world capitalist system. The structures of this system provide a hierarchical political and economic exoskeleton that constrains all national efforts to pursue any significant degree of self-directed, inward-oriented, balanced and environmentally sustainable development. Indeed, the geopolitical power structures that preserve and support the world capitalist system have made it almost impossible for the governments of the core as well as the peripheral countries in this system to pursue a path of inward-oriented, equitable, democratically controlled and environmentally sustainable development (Amin 2001b:20). Since the 1980s, inter-American relations and the economic, political and social development of the Latin American and Caribbean states have been shaped by these geo­ political structures and the neoliberal strategic agenda put forward by the government of the United States of America (USA), the major transnational corporations and the three major international financial institutions (IFIs) that operate in the Latin American and Caribbean region (Harris and Nef, 2008). This later group of IFIs includes the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). The policies of these IFIs based in Washington generally follow the dictates of the government of the USA due to the controlling influence that it exercises over these institutions. Their agenda for the Latin American and Caribbean region gives priority to promoting and protecting the interests of the major investors and transnational corporations that are largely based in the USA and operate in the region. It also serves to maintain and strengthen the geopolitical hegemony of the USA over the Western Hemisphere (Harris and Nef). But conditions are changing. Washington’s neoliberal agenda for controlling the capi­ talist development of the Western Hemisphere and maintaining US hegemony over the region is increasingly threatened by a progressive alternative agenda for the regio­ nal integration of the Latin American and Caribbean countries that has begun to gain widespread support in the region. This alternative agenda for the region calls for the autonomous economic development of the region free of the hegemonic control and influence of the USA and the IFIs based in Washington. Not only does this type of development pose a fundamental threat to the hegemony of the USA in the region, it threatens the dominance of transnational capital throughout the Americas. Moreover, it also poses a significant threat to the global expansion and integration of the world capitalist system in general and to the global hegemonic coalition led by the government and transnational corporations of the USA. Today, political and economic strategies are being developed for moving from the prevailing export-oriented neoliberal model of economic development to new in­ ward-oriented models of sustainable development, tailored to the diverse conditions, economic capacities, political structures, natural endowments and cultural values of the societies involved. Moreover, a growing number of international and regional civil society organizations have emerged in recent years to create such alternatives. What the forums, networks, programs, and activities of these various types of organizations reveal is that there is a growing international network of organizations and social movements committed to promoting new, more equitable forms of international cooperation and regulation that support inward-oriented and sustainable development as well as genuine democracy at the regional and national levels. At the same time, these organizations argue that the present global trading regime that has been erected under the WTO should and can be replaced by a new global trading system that replaces the present system of so-called free but in fact unfair trade, with a sys­ tem that ensures «fair trade» and promotes South-South economic exchange and coo­ peration. Most of the progressive alternatives advocated by these organizations and the new left-leaning governments that have been elected to office in the region give priority to aligning the external relations of the countries in the region to the internal needs of the majority of the population. That is to say, decisions about what to export and what to import should be aligned with the needs of the population rather than the interests of transnational capitalists and transnational corporations or the hegemonic interests of the USA. Some of these alternative strategies involve what Walden Bello (2002) has referred to as «deglobalization.» That is to say, they involve unlinking the economies of these peripheral capitalist societies from the advanced capitalist centers of the world economy, particularly in the USA. They also involve throwing off the constraints that have been imposed upon the economic policies and structures of the­ se countries by the IFIs (IMF, World Bank, and IDB), the WTO and the other agents and regulatory regimes that regulate the world capitalist system. In fact, there appears to be growing interest throughout Latin America in revivifying the Pan-American ideal of unification, currently perhaps best expressed in Hugo Chávez’ Bolivarian dream of turning South America into a regional economic hegemon (DeLong, 2005). The governments of Bolivia, Cuba, Ecuador, Nicaragua and Uruguay have indicated they want to join the government of Venezuela in creating a regional union. It has been proposed that this coalescing continental confederation should shift the region’s extra-continental trade towards Europe, Asia and South Africa and away from North America. The prospect of this happening appears to have alarmed Washington more than the increasing number of electoral triumphs of leftist politicians in the region (Delong). There has also been considerable talk in the region about creating a single currency for the South American countries that would be modeled on and perhaps tied to the Euro rather than the US Dollar. This discussion is symptomatic of what appears to be an emerging desire to create an integrated economic and political community that is strikingly different from the type of hemispheric economic integration scheme being pursued by the Washington and its allies in the region (DeLong). Moreover, there is an increasing tendency in the region to find alternatives to trading with the USA. In particular, several Latin American nations (Brazil, Cuba, Venezuela and Chile) have been strengthening their economic relations with Asia, particularly with China. But the widespread popular opposition to neoliberalism and so-called globalization, and the shift to the Left in the region’s politics, represent much more than a serious challenge to US hegemony, they also represent a serious threat to the existing pattern of capitalist development in the region. Central to Washington’s strategy for the hemisphere has been the imposition of a neoliberal model of capitalist development on the region which involves the increasing integration of the region’s economies into a hemispheric ‘free trade’ area or rather a trade bloc that is dominated by the USA. This project is itself an essential part of the strategy of the USA for the domination of the global economy by its transnational corporations. The restructuring of the economies of the region under the mantra of neoliberalism and the banner of globalization has been aimed at giving the USA-based transnational corporations and investors free reign within the region and a strong hemispheric base from which to dominate the world economy In opposition to the neoliberal, polyarchical and globalizing model of development that has been imposed by the government of the USA and its allies in the region, the growing movement for an alternative form of development that is both genuinely democratic, equitable and environmentally sustainable appears to be gaining ground in various parts of Latin America and the Caribbean. This alternative model of development requires the reorganization and realignment of the existing economies in the region. It also requires the replacement of the existing political regimes, which serve the interests of the transnational bloc of social forces that are behind the integration of the region into the new global circuits of accumulation and production that the major trans­ national corporations and the IFIs have been constructing since the 1970s. In addition to fundamental economic changes, most of the existing pseudo-democratic political regimes in the region need to be thoroughly democratized so that they are responsive to and capable of serving the needs and interests of the majority of the people rather than the ruling polyarchies and the transnational corporations operating in the region. An essential requirement for realigning the region’s economies so that they produce people-centered and environmentally sustainable development is the integration of these economies into a regional economic and political union that has the resources, structures and the power to operate independently of the government of the USA and the transnational corporations based in the USA as well as in the European Union and Japan. If this type of regional integration takes place, it will enable the Latin American and Caribbean states to break free of the hegemonic influence of the USA, and reverse the denationalization (‘globalization’) of the Latin American and Caribbean economies. Instead of the corporate-driven hemispheric integration of the region under the hegemony of the USA, a new system of regional economic cooperation and both equitable as well as environmentally sustainable development is desperately needed to improve the lives of the vast majority of the people living in Latin America and the Caribbean. This type of regional, equitable and sustainable development can only be success­ fully carried out by truly democratically elected political leaders with broad-based popular support who are sincerely committed to achieving this alternative rather than the elitist neoliberal model. It probably will also require democratic socialist political institutions and structures of production and distribution. Regionalism has been the dream of the democratic left for some time. The European Union has its origins in the French socialist dream of ending Franco-German enmity through unifying Europe, and African regionalism was the vision of African socialists such as Julius Nyerere of Tanzania who saw regional integration as the only means to progress beyond tribalism and colonialism and create a united and democratic Africa (Faux, 2001:4). Viewed from the perspective of those who want to create a people-cen­ tered, democratic, equitable and environmentally sustainable social order in the Ame­ ricas, the corporate-dominated process of capitalist pseudo-globalization taking place in the region and around the world urgently needs to be replaced by what Samir Amin has referred to as a new system of «pluricentric regulated globalization» (Amin, 2001a). This alternative form of globalization requires the development of regional economic and political unions in Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Caribbean, the Middle East and elsewhere, which collaboratively promote people-centered, democratic and envi­ ronmentally sustainable forms of development on a regional basis. According to Amin, these regional unions of states are needed to collaborate as partners in collecti­ vely regulating the global restructuring of the world economy for the benefit of the vast majority of humanity rather than the transnational corporations and the northern centers of the world capitalist system in the USA, Europe and Japan. This type of regional-based regulative order is needed to regulate and redirect inter­ national economic, social, and political relations so that these relations serve the inte­ rests and needs of the vast majority of the world’s population. The present power structures and regulatory regime of the world capitalist system support the transna­ tional corporate-driven restructuring and denationalization of the economies of both the societies at the core and in the periphery of this system. The Latin American and Caribbean countries need to ‘de-link’ step-by-step from this exploitative and inequitable system. They need to redirect and restructure their eco­ nomies so that they serve the needs of the majority of their people while also protec­ ting their natural resources and ecosystems. The alternative policies of economic, poli­ tical and social development proposed and in some cases adopted by the new leftist leaders, the progressive civil society organizations and their supporters, combined with the project of regional integration associated with the new Unión de Naciones Suramericanas (UNASUR), are significant indications of unprecedented and pro­ found transformation unfolding in the Americas. A growing number of civil society organizations and social movements throughout the Americas are pressuring the governments of the region to follow what the pro­ gressive civil society networks such as the Alianza Social Continental/ Hemispheric Social Alliance (ASC/HSA) describes as a regional model of integration that supports the environmentally sustainable and democratic development of all the societies in the region (see ASC-HSA, 2006). The ASC/HSA also contends that the UNASUR pro­ ject and the Bolivarian dream of unification is threatened by the so-called free trade agreements that Washington has negotiated with Chile, Colombia, Peru, the Central American countries and the Dominican Republic. As the ASC/HSA makes clear in its documents and public information campaigns, these agreements compromise the national sovereignty, obstruct the local production of medicines, threaten public health, facilitate the profit-driven privatization of water and vital services such as health and sanitation, and threaten the survival of indigenous cultures, biodiversity, food sovereignty, and local control over natural resources. The «Alternatives for the Americas» proposal developed by this inter-American network of progressive civil society organizations and social movements calls on all governments in the region to subordinate trade and investments to sustainability and environmental protection as well as social justice and local democratic control over economic and social development (ASC/HSA 2002:5). The growing number and political influence of these kinds of networks, organizations and movements provide unquestionable evidence of the emergence of the social for­ ces and political conditions that Panitch (1996:89) and others (Harris, 1995:301-302; Jo­ nas and McCaughan, 1994) predicted in the 1990s would arise in opposition to neoli­ beralism, corporate-dominated pseudo globalization and the extension and consolida­ tion of the hegemony of the USA. It now seems increasingly possible that these forces and the political mobilization that they have helped to create will transform the politi­ cal regimes in the region as well as the nature of inter-American relations, bring about the regional integration of the Latin American countries and free these countries from US hegemony and the form of ‘turbo-capitalism’ to which they have been subjected. At this point, we can only speak in general terms about the new model(s) of develop­ ment that will replace the neoliberal model of uneven and inequitable development that has pillaged most of the region.

#### The impact is mass genocide and violence against racialized others

Edgardo Lander, 2000 (Prof. of Sociology and Latin American studies at the Venezuelan Central University in Caracas, Nepantla: Views from South Volume 1, Issue 3, 2000, “Eurocentrism and Colonialism in Latin American Social Thought”, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/nepantla/summary/v001/1.3lander.html :)

Political and social thought regarding Latin America has been historically characterized by a tension between the search for its specific attributes and an external view that has seen these lands from the narrow perspective of European experience. There has also been an opposition between the challenge of the rich potentialities of this New World and distress over its difference, which stands in contrast with the ideal represented by European culture and racial composition. Nonetheless, external colonial views and regrets because of the difference have been widely hegemonic. A brief revision of the texts of the first republican constitutions is enough to illustrate how liberals, in their attempt to transplant and install a replica of their understanding of the European or North American experience, almost completely ignore the specific cultural and historical conditions of the societies about which they legislate. When these conditions are considered, it is with the express purpose of doing away with them. The affliction because of the difference—the awkwardness of living in a continent that is not white, urban, cosmopolitan, and civilized—finds its best expression in positivism. Sharing the main assumptions and prejudices of nineteenth-century European thought (scientific racism, patriarchy, the idea of progress), positivism reaffirms the colonial discourse. The continent is imagined from a single voice, with a single subject: white, masculine, urban, cosmopolitan. The rest, the majority, is the “other,” barbarian, primitive, black, Indian, who has nothing to contribute to the future of these societies. It would be imperative to whiten, westernize, or exterminate that majority.

## Poverty

### 2NC RES – Growth Trends

#### Mex econ up

The Economist, 11-24-2012, lol it’s the Economist, “Señores, start your engines,” <http://www.economist.com/news/special-report/21566782-cheaper-china-and-credit-and-oil-about-start-flowing-mexico-becoming?zid=298&ah=0bc99f9da8f185b2964b6cef412227be>

Normally that would be a good thing, but after the 2007-08 financial crisis it meant that Mexico got a terrible walloping. Thanks to its wide-open economy and high exposure to the United States it suffered the steepest recession on the American mainland: in 2009 its economy shrank by 6

%. The country had already had a rocky decade. When China joined the World Trade Organisation in 2001, it started undercutting Mexico’s export industry. In the ten years to 2010 Mexico’s economy grew by an average of just 1.6% a year, less than half the rate of Brazil, which flourished in part by exporting commodities to China. But now changes are under way, in Mexico’s factories, its financial sector and even its oil and gas fields, that augur well for a very different decade. Latin America’s perennial underachiever grew faster than Brazil last year and will repeat the trick this year, with a rate of about 4% against less than 2% in Brazil. Mr Peña is aiming to get annual growth up to 6% before his six-year presidency is over. By the end of this decade Mexico will probably be among the world’s ten biggest economies; a few bullish forecasters think it might even become the largest in Latin America. How did Mexico achieve such a turnround?

## Impact Framing

### Magnitude First

#### Extinction is the ultimate side constraint

Jonathan Schell, Distinguished Fellow, Yale Center for the Study of Globalization, 1982, The Fate of the Earth, p. 95

But the mere risk of extinction has a significance that is categorically different from, and immeasurably greater than, that of any other risk, and as we make our decisions we have to take that significance into account. Up to now, every risk has been contained within the frame of life; extinction would shatter the frame. It represents not the defeat of some purpose but an abyss in which all human purposes would be drowned for all time. We have no right to place the possibility of this limitless, eternal defeat on the same footing as risks that we run in the ordinary conduct of our affairs in our particular transient moment of human history.

#### The use of any-risk logic motivate positive responses – empirics

Ulrich Beck, xx-xx-10 Professor of Sociology at University of Munich, the British Journal of Sociology Visiting Centennial Professor at the London School of Economics and Political Sciences, and Senior Loeb Fellow at the Harvard Design School, “Climate for Change, or How to Create a Green Modernity?”<http://tcs.sagepub.com/content/27/2-3/254>

Sixth thesis: The political explosiveness of global risks is largely a function of their (re-)presentation in the mass media. When staged in the media, global risks can become 'cosmopolitan events'. The presentation and visualization of manufactured risk makes the invisible visible. It creates simultaneity, shared involvement and shared suffering, and thereby creates the relevance for a global public. Thus cosmopolitan events are highly mediatized, highly selective, highly variable, highly symbolic local and global, public and private, material and communicative, reflexive experiences and blows of fate. To understand this, we have to draw upon the picture of 'Mediapolis' so minutely and sensitively painted by Silverstone (2006) and the picture sketched much earlier by Dewey (1946). There Dewey defends the thesis that it is not actions but their consequences which lie at the heart of politics. Although he was not thinking of global warming, BSE or terrorist attacks, his theory can be applied perfectly to world risk society. A global public discourse does not arise out of a consensus on decisions, but rather out of disagreement over the consequences of decisions. Modern risk crises are constructed out of just such controversies over consequences. Although some insist on seeing an overreaction to risk, risk conflicts do indeed have an enlightening function. They destabilize the existing order but can also be seen as a vital step towards the construction of new institutions. Global risk has the power to confuse the mechanisms of organized irresponsibility and even to open them up for political action. This view of 'enforced enlightenment' and 'cosmopolitan realism' opens up the possibility that the 'manufactured uncertainties' and 'manufactured insecurities' produced by world risk society prompt transnational reflexivity, global cooperation, coordinated responses against the background of 'cosmopolitan communities of risk', so the same processes may also prompt much else besides. My emphasis on staging follows from the fact that my central concept is not 'crisis' but 'new global risk'. Risks are, essentially, man-made, incalculable, uninsurable threats and catastrophes which are anticipated but which often remain invisible and therefore depend on how they become defined and contested in 'knowledge'. As a result their 'reality' can be dramatized or minimized, transformed or simply denied, according to the norms which decide what is known and what is not. They are, to repeat myself, products of struggles and conflicts over definitions within the context of specific relations of definitional power and the (in varying degrees successful) results of staging. If this is the core understanding of risk, then this means that we must attach major significance to media staging and acknowledge the potential political explosiveness of the media. How does this correspond to empirical facts? As Cottle (2009) argues, the release in early 2007 of the latest International Panel on Climate Change report proved to be a transformative moment in the news career of climate change (IPCC, 2007).At first climate change featured relatively infrequently in scientifically framed news reports, then it was contested by a small group of news-privileged climate change sceptics, and finally it came of age as a widely recognized 'global risk' demanding responses from all the world's nations. If IPCC predictions and those of more recent scientific modelling come to pass over the next couple of decades, then climate change may yet prove to be the most powerful of forces summoning a civilizational community of fate into existence.

#### Dystopianism is good – acts as a catalyst for real-world change

Fuyuki Kurasawa, November 19th, 2004, Associate Professor of Sociology at York University in Toronto, Canada, “Cautionary Tales: The Global Culture of Prevention and the Work of Foresight,” pdf

Returning to the point I made at the beginning of this paper, the significance of foresight is a direct outcome of the transition toward a dystopian imaginary (or what Sontag has called “the imagination of disaster”).11 Huxley’s *Brave New* *World* and Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, two groundbreaking dystopian novels of the first half of the twentieth century, remain as influential as ever in framing public discourse and understanding current techno-scientific dangers, while recent paradigmatic cultural artifacts – films like *The Matrix* and novels like Atwood’s *Oryx and Crake* – reflect and give shape to this catastrophic sensibility.12 And yet dystopianism need not imply despondency, paralysis, or fear. Quite the opposite, in fact, since the pervasiveness of a dystopian imaginary can help notions of historical contingency and fallibilism gain traction against their determinist and absolutist counterparts.13 Once we recognize that the future is uncertain and that any course of action produces both unintended and unexpected consequences, the responsibility to face up to potential disasters and intervene before they strike becomes compelling. From another angle, dystopianism lies at the core of politics in a global civil society where groups mobilize their own nightmare scenarios (‘Frankenfoods’ and a lifeless planet for environmentalists, totalitarian patriarchy of the sort depicted in Atwood’s *Handmaid’s Tale* for Western feminism, McWorld and a global neoliberal oligarchy for the alternative globalization movement, etc.). Such scenarios can act as catalysts for public debate and socio-political action, spurring citizens’ involvement in the work of preventive foresight.

#### We must evaluate death through the lens of util

Driver (Professor in philosophy, researcher in Normative Ethical Theory and Moral Psychology, with related metaphysical interests in the nature of causation as well as the nature of value. Ph.D from Johns Hopkins University) 2009 (Julia “The History of Utilitarianism” <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/utilitarianism-history/> )

The virtuous person is one whose affections, motives, dispositions are of the right sort, not one whose behavior is simply of the right sort and who is able to reflect on goodness, and her own goodness [see Gill]. Similarly, the vicious person is one who exemplifies the wrong sorts of mental states, affections, and so forth. A person who harms others through no fault of his own “…because he has convulsive fits which make him strike and wound such as approach him” is not vicious since he has no desire to harm anyone and his bodily movements in this case are beyond his control.¶ Shaftesbury approached moral evaluation via the virtues and vices. His utilitarian leanings are distinct from his moral sense approach, and his overall sentimentalism. However, this approach highlights the move away from egoistic views of human nature — a trend picked up by Hutcheson and Hume, and later adopted by Mill in criticism of Bentham's version of utilitarianism. For writers like Shaftesbury and Hutcheson the main contrast was with egoism rather than rationalism.

# 2NC

## Turtles Conditions CP

### 2NC CP – AT: P/ CP – Top Level

#### “Resolved” necessitates certainty.

American Heritage Dictionary, 11-xx-2011, The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, an American dictionary of the English language published by Boston publisher Houghton Mifflin, “resolve,” <http://www.ahdictionary.com/word/search.html?q=resolved&submit.x=-826&submit.y=-210>

re·solved, re·solv·ing, re·solves v.tr. 1. a. To make a firm decision about: resolved that I would do better next time. See Synonyms at decide.

#### “Should” mandates certainty.

The Collins English Dictionary, 12-31-2011, the Collins English Dictionary, a printed and online dictionary of English, “English Dictionary – definition of “should”,” <http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/should?showCookiePolicy=true>

should Definitions verb the past tense of shall: used as an auxiliary verb to indicate that an action is considered by the speaker to be obligatory ( you should go) or to form the subjunctive mood with I or we ( I should like to see you; if I should be late, go without me) See also shall Should has, as its most common meaning in modern English, the sense ought as in I should go to the graduation, but I don't see how I can. However, the older sense of the subjunctive of shall is often used with I or we to indicate a more polite form than would: I should like to go, but I can't. In much speech and writing, should has been replaced by would in contexts of this kind, but it remains in formal English when a conditional subjunctive is used: should he choose to remain, he would be granted asylum Word Origin Old English sceold; see shall shall Definitions verb Word forms: past tense should takes an infinitive without to or an implied infinitive esp with I or we as subject used as an auxiliary to make the future tense ⇒ we shall see you tomorrow Compare will1 (sense 1) with you, he, she, it, they, or a noun as subject used as an auxiliary to indicate determination on the part of the speaker, as in issuing a threat ⇒ you shall pay for this! used as an auxiliary to indicate compulsion, now esp in official documents ⇒ the Tenant shall return the keys to the Landlord used as an auxiliary to indicate certainty or inevitability ⇒ our day shall come

#### “Should” requires immediacy.

Summers, 94 — Justice on the Oklahoma Supreme Court (“Kelsey v. Dollarsaver Food Warehouse of Durant”, 199hgghj4 OK 123, 11-8, <http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn13>)

4 The legal question to be resolved by the court is whether the word "should"[13](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn13) in the May 18 order connotes futurity or may be deemed a ruling in praesenti.[14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn14) The answer to this query is not to be divined from rules of grammar;[15](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn15) it must be governed by the age-old practice culture of legal professionals and its immemorial language usage. To determine if the omission (from the critical May 18 entry) of the turgid phrase, "and the same hereby is", (1) makes it an in futuro ruling - i.e., an expression of what the judge will or would do at a later stage - or (2) constitutes an in in praesenti resolution of a disputed law issue, the trial judge's intent must be garnered from the four corners of the entire record.[16](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn16)  5 Nisi prius orders should be so construed as to give effect to every words and every part of the text, with a view to carrying out the evident intent of the judge's direction.[17](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn17) The order's language ought not to be considered abstractly. The actual meaning intended by the document's signatory should be derived from the context in which the phrase to be interpreted is used.[18](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn18) When applied to the May 18 memorial, these told canons impel my conclusion that the judge doubtless intended his ruling as an in praesenti resolution of Dollarsaver's quest for judgment n.o.v. Approval of all counsel plainly appears on the face of the critical May 18 entry which is [885 P.2d 1358] signed by the judge.[19](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn19) True minutes[20](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn20) of a court neither call for nor bear the approval of the parties' counsel nor the judge's signature. To reject out of hand the view that in this context "should" is impliedly followed by the customary, "and the same hereby is", makes the court once again revert to medieval notions of ritualistic formalism now so thoroughly condemned in national jurisprudence and long abandoned by the statutory policy of this State. [Continues – To Footnote] [14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker2fn14) In praesenti means literally "at the present time." BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 792 (6th Ed. 1990). In legal parlance the phrase denotes that which in law is presently or immediately effective, as opposed to something that will or would become effective in the future [in futurol]. See Van Wyck v. Knevals, [106 U.S. 360](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/deliverdocument.asp?box1=106&box2=U.S.&box3=360), 365, 1 S.Ct. 336, 337, 27 L.Ed. 201 (1882).

#### “Substantial” means unconditional and immediate.

Words and Phrases, 1964 (40 W&P 759)

The words “outward, open, actual, visible, substantial, and exclusive,” in connection with a change of possession, mean substantially the same thing. They mean not concealed; not hidden; exposed to view; free from concealment, dissimulation, reserve, or disguise; in full existence; denoting that which not merely can be, but is opposed to potential, apparent, constructive, and imaginary; veritable; genuine; certain; absolute; real at present time, as a matter of fact, not merely nominal; opposed to form; actually existing; true; not including admitting, or pertaining to any others; undivided; sole; opposed to inclusive.

#### “Increase” must be immediate relative to the status quo.

Rogers 5 Judge, STATE OF NEW YORK, ET AL., PETITIONERS v. U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, RESPONDENT, NSR MANUFACTURERS ROUNDTABLE, ET AL., INTERVENORS, 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 12378, \*\*; 60 ERC (BNA) 1791, 6/24, lexis

[\*\*48]  Statutory Interpretation. [HN16](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1fe428155fdfc9074f3623f0dae9d78a&docnum=14&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=0ebd338d6a7793de8561db53b915effd&focBudTerms=term%20increase&focBudSel=all#clscc16)While the CAA defines a "modification" as any physical or operational change that "increases" emissions, it is silent on how to calculate such "increases" in emissions. [42 U.S.C. § 7411(a)(4)](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=4&_butStat=0&_butNum=103&_butInline=1&_butinfo=42%20U.S.C.%207411&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=1f89a0e47b1996a5400e8d865d8da08a). According to government petitioners, the lack of a statutory definition does not render the term "increases" ambiguous, but merely compels the court to give the term its "ordinary meaning." See [Engine Mfrs.Ass'nv.S.Coast AirQualityMgmt.Dist., 541 U.S. 246, 124 S. Ct. 1756, 1761, 158 L. Ed. 2d 529(2004)](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=104&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b541%20U.S.%20246%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=48f016ea3eabfdb898b67b348b11662c); [Bluewater Network, 370 F.3d at 13](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=105&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b370%20F.3d%201%2cat%2013%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=78fdfe9d48c7b91d7659b90c0198707e); [Am. Fed'n of Gov't Employees v. Glickman, 342 U.S. App. D.C. 7, 215 F.3d 7, 10 [\*23]  (D.C. Cir. 2000)](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=106&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b342%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%207%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=fb18ff0b92931ac00621d88dae997e67). Relying on two "real world" analogies, government petitioners contend that the ordinary meaning of "increases" requires the baseline to be calculated from a period immediately preceding the change. They maintain, for example, that in determining whether a high-pressure weather system "increases" the local temperature, the relevant baseline is the temperature immediately preceding the arrival of the weather system, not the temperature five or ten years ago. Similarly,  [\*\*49]  in determining whether a new engine "increases" the value of a car, the relevant baseline is the value of the car immediately preceding the replacement of the engine, not the value of the car five or ten years ago when the engine was in perfect condition.

#### “Toward” implies certainty.

Anne Marie Lofaso, 2-24-2010, West Virginia University, College of Law, “Talking is Worthwhile: The Role of Employee Voice in Protecting, Enhancing, and Encouraging Individual Rights to Job Security in a Collective System,” <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1558563>

The obligations placed on employers are significant in two ways. First and significantly, the Collective Redundancies Directive places on employers a duty to consult "with a view to reaching an agreement." n172 Given the Directive's language choice, this consultation right seems to be at least coextensive with the federal right to bargain under the National Labor Relations Act and perhaps even greater than the right granted under the NLRA. Federal courts interpreting NLRA Section 8(d)'s definition of the bargaining duty n173 have made clear that the duty to bargain does not include the duty to come to agreement. n174 Perhaps this is why Professor [\*86] Summers, in describing the duty to bargain under Section 8(d) always referred to it as obligating the parties to bargain in good faith with "a view toward reaching agreement." The use of the preposition "toward" suggests a duty to come close to agreement but not a duty to close the deal.

### 2NC CP – AT: Conditions Bad – TL

#### Discussions of implementation are key to education

Elmore ‘80

(Prof. Public Affairs at University of Washington, PolySci Quarterly 79-80, p. 605)

The emergence of implementation as a subject for policy analysis coincides closely with the discovery by policy analysts that decisions are not self-executing. Analysis of policy choices matter very little if the mechanism for implementing those choices is poorly understood in answering the question, "What percentage of the work of achieving a desired governmental action is done when the preferred analytic alternative has been identified?" Allison estimated that in the normal case, it was about 10 percent, leaving the remaining 90 percent in the realm of implementation.

### 2NC CP S – AT: Say No – Top Level

#### Mexico says yes – Economic engagement can be used as leverage to encourage Mexican sea turtle protection.

Adam Yogel, 5-02-2013, writer for and member of Pace Baja, the production and research journal for Pace University’s award winning documentary travel course, “Conservation Groups Press U.S. to Sanction Mexico Over Sea Turtle Deaths,” http://pacebaja.wordpress.com/2013/05/02/conservation-groups-press-u-s-to-sanction-mexico-over-sea-turtle-deaths/

The Center For Biological Diversity and Sea Turtle Restoration Project have petitioned the United States government to impose trade sanctions on Mexico for failing to abide by international sea turtle conservation agreements. Their core concern is described this way: “Over the past decade, scientists estimate that Mexican gillnet and longline fisheries have killed over 2,000 endangered North Pacific Ocean loggerheads a year. Bycatch reached a record high last July, when a mass mortality event left 483 loggerheads stranded on just one stretch of beach – a 600 percent increase over previous years’ averages. This extraordinarily high level of bycatch cannot be sustained and may ultimately drive this endangered sea turtle population to extinction.” [news release] The groups say the United States has leverage through the Inter-American Convention for the Protection and Conservation of Sea Turtles. The decade-old agreement is designed to protect both dwindling sea turtle populations and the habitat they rely on for feeding and breeding. The “bycatch” of loggerhead sea turtles in gillnets is centered in ocean waters off Magdalena Bay, Mexico, the focal point of our documentary, which will be released next week. In an interview earlier this week, Sarah Uhlemann, a senior attorney for the Center for Biological Diversity, said the surge in deaths of loggerheads is enough to invoke the “Pelly Amendment,” which allows the U.S. to sanction any country that violates the treaty. In the next several years, a ban on imports of certain Mexican seafood products could be instituted by the U.S Commerce Department if government agencies find that the loggerhead bycatch has not been addressed.

## Irrigation Pipelines DA

### AT: Resiliency

Resiliency does not apply

Craig 11 (Robin Kundis Craig, Attorneys’ Title Professor of Law and Associate Dean for Environmental Programs, Florida State University College of Law, Tallahassee, Florida, 12/20/11 “Legal Remedies for Deep Marine Oil Spills and Long-Term Ecological Resilience: A Match Made in Hell” <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1906839>)

Importantly, however, the second aspect of resilience theory acknowledges that ecosystems can exist in multiple states rather than stabilizing around a single equilibrium state; as a result, changes and disturbances can “push” ecosystems over thresholds from one ecosystem state to another.146 This second sense of resilience “assumes multiple states (or ‘regimes’) and is defined as the magnitude of a disturbance that triggers a shift between alternative states.”147 For example, the boreal forests of Canada can exist in at least two states with respect to spruce budworms: a “no outbreak” state“characterized by low numbers of budworm and young, fastgrowing trees,” and an “outbreak” state “characterized by high numbers of budworm and old, senescent trees.”148 The shift between the two appears to relate to an increase in canopy volume, which in turn affects bird populations and the birds’ ability to control the pest.149 Regime-shift models can also help to explain outbreaks of some human diseases.150 However, natural resources law and policy generally do not acknowledge this second sense of resilience, and, as a result, it generally does not incorporate mechanisms for acknowledging, responding to, or even trying to avoid ecological regime shifts. Finally, resilience theory also acknowledges “the surprising and discontinuous nature of change, such as the collapse of fish stock or the sudden outbreak of spruce budworms in forests.”151 In other words, the long-time persistence of an ecosystem (or collection of multiple ecosystems) like the Gulf of Mexico in an apparently stable, productive ecosystem state is absolutely no guarantee that humans can continue to disturb and abuse the system and expect only a gradual or linear response. As was true for the second sense of resilience, natural resource law in general and marine resources law in particular do not deal well with the possibility of sudden and dramatic ecosystem changes. Nevertheless, such regime shifts have been documented for a number of marine ecosystems. For example, In Jamaica, the effects of overfishing, hurricane damage, and disease have combined to destroy most corals, whose abundance has declined from more than 50 percent in the late 1970s to less than 5 percent today. A dramatic phase shift has occurred, producing a system dominated by fleshy macroalgae (more than 90 percent cover). Immediate implementation of management procedures is necessary to avoid further catastrophic damage.152Similarly, the presence or absence of sea otters can significantly influence the structure and function of Alaskan kelp forests because the otters, when present, control sea urchin populations, allowing for more extensive coral growth.153 In some locations, moreover, “sea urchin population changes in response to sea otter predation were rapid and extreme” and could result in “short-term changes in kelp density.”154The current law, policy, and remedy regime for offshore oil drilling effectively presumes that marine ecosystems have virtually unlimited first-sense resilience with respect to oil spills—in crudest terms, that restoration will always be possible, and perhaps even through entirely natural means.155 Our experience with the last large oil spill in U.S. waters, however, suggests otherwise. More than twenty years before the Deepwater Horizon disaster, on March 24, 1989, the oil tanker Exxon Valdez ran aground in Prince William Sound, Alaska, spilling approximately eleven million gallons of crude oil.156 Although the oil eventually affected about 1300 miles of Alaskan coastline,157 it is important to remember that, in the context of the Deepwater Horizon spill, the Exxon Valdez was a relatively simple—and relatively small—surface release of oil. Even so, more than twenty years later, according to NOAA, “While the vast majority of the spill area now appears to have recovered, pockets of crude oil remain in some locations, and there is evidence that some damage is continuing.”158 More specifically, NOAA reports that, overall, the Prince William Sound ecosystem has proven resilient in the first sense—it has been able to absorb most changes and persist in function and relationships.159Nevertheless, NOAA has also cautioned that “impacts from the spill remain”: 􀁸 Deeply penetrated oil continues to visibly leach from a few beaches, such as Smith Island. 􀁸 In some areas, intertidal animals, such as mussels, are still contaminated by oil, affecting not only the mussels but any animals (including people) that eat them. 􀁸 Some rocky sites that were stripped of heavy plant cover by high-pressure, hot-water cleaning remain mostly bare rock. 􀁸 Rich clam beds that suffered high mortalities from oil and extensive beach cleaning have not re-colonized to their previous levels.160 Notably, NOAA concludes that “Prince William Sound has made a remarkable recovery from a severe injury, but it remains an ecosystem in transition.”161In other words, twenty years after a major surface spill of oil, Prince William Sound has not fully recovered and, indeed, may never do so. Its first-sense resilience to oil spills is incomplete,or at least operates over substantial time scales, and we may eventually find (or decide) that ecological communities within the Sound have in fact experienced resilience in the second sense: an ecological regime shift. As one possible example, NOAA reports that “[b]eginning in 1990, scientists saw the cover of rockweed increase steadily at oiled sites— until 1994, that is. From 1994 through 1995, there appeared to be a noticeable decline in cover, especially at sites that had been oiled.”162 While scientists are still searching for an explanation, the three candidates—a disruption in the normal mix of rockweed ages, an explosion in the populations of grazers such as periwinkle snails, or a longer-term toxic effect of the oil163—all suggest that the oil spill may have induced (or at least threatened) a regime shift. These results suggest that we should be very concerned for the Gulf ecosystems affected by the Macondo well blowout. First, and as this Article has emphasized throughout, unlike the Exxon Valdez spill, the Deepwater Horizon oil spill occurred at great depth, and the oil behaved unusually compared to oil released on the surface. Second, considerably more toxic dispersants were used in connection with the Gulf oil spill than the Alaska oil spill.164 Third, humans could intervene almost immediately to begin cleaning the rocky substrate in Prince William Sound, but human intervention for many of the important affected Gulf ecosystems, especially the deepwater ones (but even for shallower coral reefs), remains impossible. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the Prince William Sound was and remains a far less stressed ecosystem than the Gulf of Mexico. In 2008, for example, NOAA stated that “[d]espite the remaining impacts of the [still then] largest oil spill in U.S. history, Prince William Sound remains a relatively pristine, productive and biologically rich ecosystem.”165 To be sure, the Sound was not completely unstressed, and “[w]hen the Exxon Valdez spill occurred in March 1989, the Prince William Sound ecosystem was also responding to at least three notable events in its past: an unusually cold winter in 1988–89; growing populations of reintroduced sea otters; and a 1964 earthquake.”166 Nevertheless, the Gulf of Mexico is besieged by environmental stressors at another order of magnitude (or two), reducing its resilience to disasters like the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. As the Deepwater Horizon Commission detailed at length, the Gulf faces an array of long-term threats, from the loss of protective and productive wetlands along the coast to hurricanes to a growing “dead zone” (hypoxic zone) to sediment starvation to sealevel rise to damaging channeling to continual (if smaller) oil releases from the thousands of drilling operations.167 In the face of this plethora of stressors, even the Commission championed a kind of resilience thinking, recognizing that responding to the oil spill alone was not enough. It equated restoration of the Gulf to “restored resilience,” arguing that it “represents an effort to sustain these diverse, interdependent activities [fisheries, energy, and tourism] and the environment on which they depend for future generations.”16

# 1NR

## Impact Framing

### Extinction First

#### Save as many as you can

Cummisky ‘96

(David, professor of philosophy at Bates, Kantian Consequentialism, p. 131)

Finally, even if one grants that saving two persons with dignity cannot outweigh and compensate for killing one—because dignity cannot be added and summed this way—this point still does not justify deontological constraints. On the extreme interpretation, why would not killing one person be a stronger obligation than saving two persons? If I am concerned with the priceless dignity of each, it would seem that I *may* still save two; it is just that my reason cannot be that the two compensate for the loss of one. Consider Hill’s example of a priceless object: If I can save two of three priceless statutes only by destroying one, then I cannot claim that saving two is not outweighed by the one that was not destroyed. Indeed, even if dignity cannot be simply summed up, how is the extreme interpretation inconsistent with the idea that I should save as many priceless objects as possible? Even if two do not simply outweigh and thus compensate for the loss of one, each is priceless; thus, I have good reason to save as many as I can. In short, it is not clear how the extreme interpretation justifies the ordinary killing/letting-die distinction or even how it conflicts with the conclusion that the more persons with dignity who are saved, the better.

#### And, we have an obligation to prevent extinction

Bostrom, 5

(Nick, professor of philosophy at Oxford, July, Transcribed from by Packer, 4:38-6:12 of the talk at http://www.ted.com/index.php/talks/view/id/44, accessed 10/20/07)

Now if we think about what just reducing the probability of human extinction by just one percentage point. Not very much. So that’s equivalent to 60 million lives saved, if we just count currently living people. The current generation. One percent of six billion people is equivalent to 60 million. So that’s a large number. If we were to take into account future generations that will never come into existence if we blow ourselves up then the figure becomes astronomical. If we could you know eventually colonize a chunk of the universe the virgo supercluster maybe it will take us a hundred million years to get there but if we go extinct we never will. Then even a one percentage point reduction in the extinction risk could be equivalent to this astronomical number 10 to the power of 32 so if you take into account future generations as much as our own every other moral imperative or philanthropic cause just becomes irrelevant. The only thing you should focus on would be to reduce existential risk, because even the tiniest decrease in existential risk would just overwhelm any other benefit you could hope to achieve. Even if you just look at the current people and ignore the potential that would be lost if we went extinct it should still be a high priority.