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#### Immortal Tech – Poverty of Philosophy

The problem with always being a conformist is that when you try to change the system from within, it's not you who changes the system; it's the system that will eventually change you. There is usually nothing wrong with compromise in a situation, but compromising yourself in a situation is another story completely, and I have seen this happen long enough in the few years that I've been alive to know that it's a serious problem. Latino America is a huge colony of countries whose presidents are cowards in the face of economic imperialism. You see, third world countries are rich places, abundant in resources, and many of these countries have the capacity to feed their starving people and the children we always see digging for food in trash on commercials. But plutocracies, in other words a government run by the rich such as this one and traditionally oppressive European states, force the third world into buying overpriced, unnecessary goods while exporting huge portions of their natural resources.

#### Oil development is part of the Eurocentric logic that ignores indigenous pleas to leave them alone and exploits the entirety of Latin America

Stetson, Boise State Assistant Professor, 11

(George, PhD, Assistant Professor, Boise State University, 2011, Ethnicity from Various Angles and Through Varied Lenses: Yesterday's Today in Latin America, “Indigenous Resistance to Oil Development”, Google Books, Page 225, Accessed 7/10/13, NC)

There is still much work to do in terms of understanding the positions of indigenous peoples. Part of the difficulty is related to the level of diversity within the indigenous movement. Furthermore, indigenous peoples are often weary of (and take offense to) attempts to speak for all indigenous peoples. However, some of the difficulty also lies in the degree of sophistication in many of indigenous responses, arguments, and positions. This sophistication- combined with the state's Eurocentric mindset -has made it increasingly difficult for state to take indigenous claims seriously.

FINAL COMMENTS: EUROCENTRIC MODERNITY AND THE ERASURE OF INDIGENOUS POLITICS

My argument is that the Peruvian state finds it difficult to understand indigenous political positions because they are stuck in a Eurocentric conception of modernity, which owes its existence to Europe, not to the realities, experiences, and histories of the indigenous peoples of Latin America. Eurocentric modernity is based on universal values, a teleological notion of development - the apex being Europe and the United States - and a modern-capitalist ( and socialist) framework that values land and natural resources as exploitable material for the benefit of the modern nation. Following this logic, it is difficult for the state to understand how anyone could oppose oil development, especially "poor" people from the Amazon, which is perhaps why Garda repeatedly argues that indigenous ideological backwardness is one of the main obstacles to Peruvian development and also why the president of Perupetro finds it difficult to understand why "poor" indigenous peoples might oppose oil development.

#### Global development from coloniality is the root cause of biological destruction

Escobar, 6

(Arturo Escobar Political Ecology of Globality and Diference Gestión y Ambiente, vol. 9, núm. 3, diciembre, 2006, pp. 29-44, Universidad Nacional de Colombia Colombiam, 2006, http://www.redalyc.org/pdf/1694/169421027009.pdf, NC)

According to some arguments, today’s politics of difference and sameness is still deeply shaped by the myths of universality and cultural superiority that since the dawn of modernity —the conquest of America by Spain in 1492— allowed the West to define the identity of the other. Since then, an ensemble of Western, modern cultural forces (including a particular view of the economy) has not ceased to exert its influence –often its dominance— over most world regions. These forces continue to operate at present through the ever­changing interaction of forms of European thought and culture, taken to be universally valid, with the seemingly perpetually subordinated knowledges and cultural practices of many non­European groups throughout the world. Eurocentric globality thus has an obligatory counterpart in the systematic act of encubrimiento del otro (the covering up of otherness), to use the expression of Latin American philosopher Enrique Dussel (1992) –that is, in a kind of “global coloniality.” This book is then, in a very abstract but real sense, about the dynamic of an imperial globality and its global regime of coloniality as one of the most salient features of the modern colonial world system in the early twenty­first century. It is also, in a literal sense, about the geopolitics of knowledge –whose knowledge counts and what does this have to do with place, culture and power. 1 The flesh and blood of the story comes from a particular region in Latin America, the Colombian Pacific. Customarily described as a poor and forgotten hot and humid forest crisscrossed by innumerable rivers and inhabited by black and indigenous groups –a litoral recóndito, as Sofonías Yacup, a local author and politician had put it already in the 1930s— the region has indeed been integrated into the world economy since the early post­Conquest period through exploration, slavery, gold mining, and the subjection or elimination of indigenous inhabitants. Cycles of boom and bust have succeeded each other over the past two centuries tied to the extraction of raw materials (gold, platinum, precious woods, timber, rubber and, mode recently, biodiversity), each leaving its indelible imprint on the social, economic, ecological and cultural make up of the place. Only by the early 1980s, however, was the region subjected to an explicit and overarching strategy of incorporation into the national and transnational spheres in the name of development. As a result, by the early 1990s the region had become the stage of an intense cultural politics that brought together development experts, black and indigenous activists, biodiversity conservation advocates, capitalists, fortune seekers, government officials, and academics into a tight space of dialogue, negotiation and confrontation that, albeit for a brief moment, seemed to have an unclear resolution, with local movements and their allies making a valiant and brilliant attempt at providing a workable alternative. Two other factors were crucial in creating the context for the complex encounter: the decided opening of the national economy to world markets after 1990 under neo­ liberal dictates; and the reform of the national constitution in 1991 which, among other things, resulted in a law that granted cultural and territorial rights to the black communities (Ley 70 of 1993). By the late 1990s, however, the regime of imperial globality had reasserted itself with force and the region became submerged into a quagmire of violence, intolerance and massive displacement that has affected black and indigenous communities and the environment with particular virulence –a reassertion of the coloniality of knowledge, power and nature, in other words.

#### Their top-down approach to engagement justifies racist and colonialist legacy – colonial strategies of engagement homogenize cultural groups. We have an ethical obligation to preserve cultural identity

Quijano, Peruvian Sociologist, 2k

(Anibal, Peruvian sociologist and humanist thinker, known for having developed the concept of "coloniality of power". His body of work has been influential in the fields of post-colonial studies and critical theory, 2000, Duke University Press, “Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America”, http://www.unc.edu/~aescobar/wan/wanquijano.pdf, Accessed 7/5/13, JB)

Parallel to the historical relations between capital and precapital, a similar set of ideas was elaborated around the spatial relations between Europe and non-Europe. As I have already mentioned, the foundational myth of the Eurocentric version of modernity is the idea of the state of nature as the point of departure for the civilized course of history whose culmination is European or Western civilization. From this myth originated the specifically Eurocentric evolutionist perspective of linear and unidirectional movement and changes in human history. Interestingly enough, this myth was associated with the racial and spatial classification of the world’s population. This association produced the paradoxical amalgam of evolution and dualism, a vision that becomes meaningful only as an expression of the exacerbated ethnocentrism of the recently constituted Europe; by its central and dominant place in global, colonial/modern capitalism; by the new validity of the mystified ideas of humanity and progress, dear products of the Enlightenment; and by the validity of the idea of race as the basic criterion for a universal social classification of the world’s population. The historical process is, however, very different. To start with, in the moment that the Iberians conquered, named, and colonized America (whose northern region, North America, would be colonized by the British a century later), they found a great number of different peoples, each with its own history, language, discoveries and cultural products, memory and identity. The most developed and sophisticated of them were the Aztecs, Mayas, Chimus, Aymaras, Incas, Chibchas, and so on. Three hundred years later, all of them had become merged into a single identity: Indians. This new identity was racial, colonial, and negative. The same happened with the peoples forcefully brought from Africa as slaves: Ashantis, Yorubas, (End Page 551) Zulus, Congos, Bacongos, and others. In the span of three hundred years, all of them were Negroes or blacks. This resultant from the history of colonial power had, in terms of the colonial perception, two decisive implications. The first is obvious: peoples were dispossessed of their own and singular historical identities. The second is perhaps less obvious, but no less decisive: their new racial identity, colonial and negative, involved the plundering of their place in the history of the cultural production of humanity. From then on, there were inferior races, capable only of producing inferior cultures. The new identity also involved their relocation in the historical time constituted with America first and with Europe later: from then on they were the past. In other words, the model of power based on coloniality also involved a cognitive model, a new perspective of knowledge within which non-Europe was the past, and because of that inferior, if not always primitive.

#### The alternative is an engagement in an organic Hip Hop countermovement, which creates multiple diverse forms of resistance from below to colonial globalization.

Hibbard, 3

(A senior at the University of Puget Sound majoring in international political economy) (Noah, “”Popilar Public Resistance”, http://upress.kent.edu/nieman/popular\_public\_resistance.htm)

The opening quote exemplifies four critical characteristics of hip-hop culture, they are: (1) its transcendental cultural space, “nation”; (2) its inherent contradictions, “paradox perpetrators”; (3) its representation of the marginalized, “black youth”; and (4) its resistance to mainstream, “industry” representations of the culture. Each of these characteristics is a derivative of the neoliberal hegemonic function. **Free-market capitalism has “commodified”2 and “co-opted”3 hip-hop culture** (although not completely as we shall see later) **and this creates fragmentation of thought and contradiction in action. However, in dialectical reaction there are organic countermovements that are resistant and “antithetical” to the hegemonies that oppress them**.**4 The process of globalization has stretched and deepened hip-hop’s predominance, allowing its cultural influence to transcend the boundaries of race, class, gender, religion, and region. In doing so, voice is often given to the voiceless**. **Therefore, hip-hop culture could serve as a conduit for electric and eclectic resistance from below, a key factor in challenging globalization from above**.¶ To fully explore all the nuances of hip-hop as resistance, this paper will first discuss three theories of resistance: countermovements, counterhegemony, and infrapolitics.5 **Countermovements explain why and what people resist (with some how, as well) and counterhegemony and infrapolitics explain how people resist**. These three theories account for the ideal type outputs of the resistance matrix, whose inputs are: undeclared or declared, singular or collective, unorganized or organized, and reformist or revolutionary**. The various outputs of the resistance matrix are resisting neoliberal ideological domination because it produces a system of norms, values, meanings, and identities that promote non-egalitarian economic, political, and social interests. Hip-hop culture, because of its historic and organic antithetical nature, indirect critiques of neoliberal globalization, supranational coherence, diverse body of agents, and deep and wide range of engaged resistance strategies, is a critical contributor to resistance from below to top-heavy neoliberal globalization**.¶ By photographing hip-hop culture through the theoretical lenses of the Polanyi-Gramsci-Scott triad and contrasting their negatives to the ideological pictures of neoliberal globalization, hip-hop’s counterhegemonic image is brought to the forefront**. Hip-hop culture performs an instrumental role in challenging the hegemony of neoliberal ideology, and thus globalization, through a variety of forms of resistance that carve dissident cultural enclaves**. These hidden enclaves of resistance are a viable forum for the formulation, elaboration, and dissemination of a counterhegemonic consciousness and culture**, which is a prerequisite for any solidified and sustained form of resistance (countermovements, wars of position, and wars of movement**).

## environment

#### SPECIES LOSS IS KEY TO EVOLUTIONARY CHANGE AND LONG-TERM BENEFIT

### BOULTER 2002

(Michael, professor of paleobiology at the University of East London, Extinction: Evolution and the End of Man, p. 170)

The same trend of long-drawn-out survival of the final relicts has been further considered by Bob May’s group at Oxford, particularly Sean Nee. The Oxford group are vociferous wailers of gloom and doom: ‘Extinction episodes, such as the anthropogenic one currently under way, result in a pruned tree of life.’ But they go on to argue that the vast majority of groups survive this pruning, so that evolution goes on, albeit along a different path if the environment is changed. Indeed, the fossil record has taught us to expect a vigorous evolutionary response when the ecosystem changes significantly.

This kind of research is more evidence to support the idea that evolution thrives on culling. The planet did really wellfrom the Big Five mass-extinction events. The victims’ demise enabled new environments to develop and more diversification took place in other groups of animals and plants. Nature was the richer for it. In just the same way the planet can take advantage from the abuse we are giving it. The harder the abuse, the greater the change to the environment. But it also follows that it brings forward the extinctions of a whole selection of vulnerable organisms.

#### Complex systems are more prone to total failure—simple ones are stable

### HEATH 1999

(Jim, Orchids Australia, December, http://www.orchidsaustralia.com/whysave.htm)

Some people say we can’t afford to lose any species, no matter what species they are. Everything needs everything else, they say, to make nature balance. If that were right, it might explain why the six orchid species should be saved. Alas, no. We could pour weedkiller on all the orchids in Australia and do no ecological damage to the rest of the continent’s biology. But wouldn’t the natural ecological systems then become less stable, if we start plucking out species - even those orchids? Not necessarily. Natural biological systems are hardly ever stable and balanced anyway. Everything goes along steadily for a time, then boom - the system falls apart and simplifies for no visible reason. Diverse systems are usually more unstable than the less diverse ones.

Biologists agree that in some placesless diversity is more stable (in the Arctic, for example). Also, monocultures - farms - can be very stable. Not to mention the timeless grass of a salt marsh. In other words, there’s no biological law that says we have to save the orchids because they add diversity, and that added diversity makes the biological world more stable.

#### No impact – the US has stopped the destruction of wetlands and trends are leading towards recovery

WordPress, 8

(“Wetland Destruction,” http://checklisttowardzerocarbon.wordpress.com/2008/07/24/wetland-destruction-another-agw-puzzle-piece/)

**A bit of good news here in the U.S., since there’s been so little, should be noted: Not only has the U.S. largely stopped wetland destruction, it is undergoing significant wetland restoration, most notably in the Florida Everglades: The US will spend $700 million over two decades to revive the Florida Everglades**. It will include six artificial wetlands (”storm water treatment areas”), to receive and cleanse excess nutrients from neighbouring farm districts.

#### 2. Alt cause – droughts cause wetland destruction

JPG Magazine, 8

(“Global Warming and Wetland Destruction,” http://www.jpgmag.com/stories/4656/flag)

**This year's severe droughts caused major destruction to the wetland enviroment. Sudden drops in water levels caused thousands of fish to be trapped in tide pools where they eventually died**. Many species of birds were forced to relocate due to the decrease in water and therefore decrease in the amounts of food. Larger creatures such as alligators, wild hogs, deer, bobcats, foxes, Florida panthers and many many others are struggling to survive. Where once beautiful marsh lands and tide pools existed, now resembles a deserted wasteland. **The earth is dried, cracked and barren. The only signs of life are the few tracks left behind from the animals scavengering. A very depressing site after seeing dolphins frolicing in the same area only a few short months ago**.

#### 3. Status quo solves – trend towards rebuilding not destroying wetlands

Goldstein, 1

(Natalie, Science writer specializing in environmental subjects, “Erosion Control,” http://www.forester.net/ec\_0105\_constructed.html)

**Once viewed as wasteland, good only for draining and filling, wetlands are now increasingly being appreciated. In the United States, more than 50% of wetlands have been destroyed**, with agriculture accounting for 87% of the losses. **Today wetland destruction is largely controlled or prohibited by governments–local, state, and federal. In fact, the trend today is toward restoring and, in some cases, constructing wetlands for the many benefits they provide**: wastewater and stormwater purification, both point- and nonpoint-source pollution control in urban and agricultural areas, wildlife habitat, sediment filtration, and erosion reduction.

#### 4. Alt cause – developers allowed to dry out wetlands

St. Petersburg Times, 5

(‘Issuing permits for destroying wetlands: This is a job for,” http://www.sptimes.com/2005/10/04/State/Issuing\_permits\_for\_d.shtml)

**The state can take over issuing some permits for destroying Florida's wetlands from the federal government, a state agency reported Monday**. But the state Department of Environmental Protection said it would need more money, and perhaps more time, to do so. **Currently, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers issues permits for developers who want to wipe out wetlands, while the state issues a permit that says destroying the wetlands will not cause pollution**. Developers, frustrated over lengthy delays in obtaining wetlands permits, pushed a bill through the Legislature this spring ordering the state DEP to investigate taking over some permitting from the corps - say, for projects of 10 acres or fewer.

#### 5. No impact – ‘no net loss’ policy means that even if wetlands are destroyed new ones will be built to replace them

Kenyon University, 1

(“Wetland Policy,” http://biology.kenyon.edu/fennessy/AMN%20Wetland%20Webpage/Comps%20Webpage/wetlandpolicy.htm)

In 1986, in response to an outcry by the organization Ducks Unlimited about the decline in duck population, President George W. **Bush, Senior promised to achieve "no net loss of wetlands"** (Searchinger 1992). **This promise lead to the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, signed in December of 1989, which provides funding to buy and protect wetlands throughout continental North America** (S.804). This, however, is a problem because an estimated 75 percent of the nation's wetlands are located on private property (National Research Council 2001). This policy has become increasingly controversial as development expands. **In order to achieve "no net loss" of wetlands, mitigation became a viable policy option for replacing destroyed wetlands. Mitigation consists of the restoration or creation of a wetland**.

#### Empirically denied and alternate causality – hundreds of thousands of species die annually

Paltrowitz, 01

(JD Brooklyn Journal of I-Law, 2001 (A Greening of the World Trade Organisation”)

**However, the panel did not take into account the practical reality that negotiations are time-consuming. The environment, animal life and human life can all be irreparably harmed as time passes. n105 For instance, one scholar has reported (\*1807) that** "**the world is losing between 27,000 and 150,000 species per year, approximately seventy-four species every day, and three every hour and up to seventy percent of the world's fisheries are depleted or under stress after years of over-exploitation**." **n106 This concern is especially pertinent in the case of the eastern spinner dolphin and coastal spotted dolphin, which are on the endangered species list. n107 Yet, even for the dolphin species that are not endangered, a similar concern applies because if dolphins continue to be maimed or killed in tuna purse seines then their numbers could become seriously depleted to the point where they may be put on the endangered species list. In short, Tuna-Dolphin I shows the preeminence of trade values at the expense of environmental values. Therefore, the panel's acknowledgment of the WTO's Preamble rang hollow when it stated: " . . . that the provisions of the GATT impose few constraints on a contracting party's implementation of domestic environmental policies." n108**

#### 2. Species extinction won't cause human extinction – humans and the environment are adaptable

Doremus, 2K

(Holly, Professor of Law at UC Davis Washington & Lee Law Review, Winter 57 Wash & Lee L. Rev. 11, lexis)

**In recent years, this discourse frequently has taken the form of the ecological horror story** . **That too is no mystery. The ecological horror story is unquestionably an attention-getter, especially in the hands of skilled writers (\*46) like Carson and the Ehrlichs. The image of the airplane earth, its wings wobbling as rivet after rivet is carelessly popped out, is difficult to ignore.** **The apocalyptic depiction of an impending crisis of potentially dire proportions is designed to spur the political community to quick action** . **Furthermore, this story suggests a goal that appeals to many nature lovers: that virtually everything must be protected. To reinforce this suggestion, tellers of the ecological horror story often imply that the relative importance of various rivets to the ecological plane cannot be determined. They offer reams of data and dozens of anecdotes demonstrating the unexpected value of apparently useless parts of nature. The moth that saved Australia from prickly pear invasion, the scrubby Pacific yew, and the downright unattractive leech are among the uncharismatic flora and fauna who star in these anecdotes. n211** **The moral is obvious: because we cannot be sure which rivets are holding the plane together, saving them all is the only sensible course**. **Notwithstanding its attractions, the material discourse in general, and the ecological horror story in particular, are not likely to generate policies that will satisfy nature lovers. The ecological horror story implies that there is no reason to protect nature until catastrophe looms. The Ehrlichs' rivet-popper account, for example, presents species simply as the (fungible) hardware holding together the ecosystem. If we could be reasonably certain that a particular rivet was not needed to prevent a crash, the rivet-popper story suggests that we would lose very little by pulling it out. Many environmentalists, though, would disagree. Reluctant to concede such losses, tellers of the ecological horror story highlight how close a catastrophe might be, and how little we know about what actions might trigger one. But** **the apocalyptic vision is less credible today than it seemed in the 1970s. Although it is clear that the earth is experiencing a mass wave of extinctions, the complete elimination of life on earth seems unlikely**. **Life is remarkably robust. Nor is human extinction probable any time soon. Homo sapiens is adaptable to nearly any environment. Even if the world of the future includes far fewer species, it likely will hold people. One response to this credibility problem tones the story down a bit, arguing not that humans will go extinct but that ecological disruption will bring economies, and consequently civilizations, to their knees. But this too may be overstating the case. Most ecosystem functions are performed by multiple species. This functional redundancy means that a high proportion of species can be lost without precipitating a collapse.**

#### 3. Collapse is common – won’t spillover

#### 4. New species fill the void

Kerr, 94

(Richard, Science 28)

**In the immediate aftermath of an extinction, some taxa** – groups of animals such as species or genera – flourish, then gradually fade. Others **that had apparently vanished can reappear**, Lazarus-like. In the turmoil, **new groups may gain ascendancy, filling ecological niches left empty by the extinction and displacing other survivors to create a new ecological order** (See box on p.29).

#### 5. No spillover to other species

Moore, 98

(Thomas, Climate of fear, why we shouldn’t worry about global warming, 1998, p.98-99)

Nevertheless, **the loss of a class of living beings does not typically threaten other species. Most animals and plants can derive** their nutrients or receive the other **benefits provided by a particular species from more than a single source. If it were true that the extinction of a single species would produce a cascade of losses, then the massive extinctions of the past should have wiped out all life.** Evolution forces various life forms to adjust to change. A few may not make the adaptation but others will mutate to meet the new conditions. Although a particular chain of DNA may be eliminated through the loss of species, other animals or plants adapting to the same environment often produce similar genetic solutions with like proteins. **It is almost impossible to imagine a single species that, if eliminated, would threaten us humans**. Perhaps if the E. coli that are necessary for digestion became extinct, we could no longer exist. But those bacteria live in a symbiotic relationship with man and, as long as humans survive, so will they. Thus any animal that hosts a symbiotic species need not fear the loss of its partner. As long as the host remains, so will parasites and symbiotic species.

#### No solvency for relations---Cuba doesn’t want it and doesn’t believe we’ll follow through

Anya Landau French 13, Director of the New America Foundation U.S. – Cuba Policy Initiative, 2/10/13, “Secretary Kerry: Will He or Won't He Take On Cuba?,” http://thehavananote.com/2013/02/secretary\_kerry\_will\_he\_or\_wont\_he\_take\_cuba

And, then there’s the Cuban government. As much as many in the Cuban government (particularly the diplomatic corps) want to reduce tensions with the United States and finally make real progress on long-standing grievances held by both sides, they aren’t desperate for the big thaw. Many U.S. analysts, including in government, speculate that this is because Cuba’s leaders don’t really want to change the relationship, that strife serves their needs better than would the alternative. That could be so, but there’s also a hefty amount of skepticism and pride on the Cuban side, as well. After so many decades and layers of what Cuba calls the U.S. blockade, Cubans are unwilling to have the terms of any ‘surrender’ dictated to them. In fact, they are bound and determined that there will be no surrender. They would argue, what is there to surrender but their government’s very existence, something the leadership obviously isn’t going to put on the table.¶ Many in the Cuban government question whether the U.S. would offer anything that truly matters to Cuba, or honor any commitments made. Arguably, the last deal the U.S. made good on was struck during the Missile Crisis of October 1963, and Cuba wasn’t even at the table for that. It’s a lesser known fact that the United States never fully implemented the 1994/1995 migration accords, which committed both nations to work to prevent migration by irregular means. The U.S. did stop accepting illegal migrants from Cuba found at sea, but it still accepts them when they reach our shores – thus dubbed our ‘wet foot, dry foot’ policy. And with our generous adjustment policy offering a green card after one year, the incentive to make the illegal trip remains largely in place.

#### Even if they “help” nature, it remains within a technological framework, ensuring the replication of the impacts.

Katz, 2K

(Eric Katz, associate professor of philosophy and director of the Science, Technology, and Society Program, New Jersey Institute of Technology; recognized pioneer, environmental ethics, 2K, Nature as Subject: Human Obligation and Natural Community)

Even more important, **the question arises whether or not Nature can heal these wounds of human oppression**. **Consider the reverse process, the human attempt to heal the wounds of Nature. We** often **tend to clean up natural areas polluted or damaged by human activity**, such as the Alaskan coast harmed by the Exxon Valdez oil spill. But we also attempt to improve natural areas dramatically altered by natural events, such as a forest damaged by a massive brush fire, or a beach suffering severe natural erosion. In most of these kinds of cases, human science and technology are capable of making a significant change in the appearance and processes of the natural area. **Forests can be replanted, oil is removed from the surface of bays and estuaries, sand and dune vegetation replenish a beach. But are these activities the healing of Nature? Has human activity—science and technology—restored Nature to a healthy state**? **No. When humans modify a natural area they create an artifact**, a product **of** human labor and **human design**. [12](http://www.questia.com/reader/action/gotoDocId/102677620) **This** restored natural **area may resemble a wild and unmodified natural system, but it is, in actuality, a product of human thought, the result of human desires and interests. All humanly created artifacts are manifestations of human interests**—from computer screens to rice pudding. **An ecosystem restored by human activity** may appear to be in a different category—it **may appear to be an autonomous living system** uncontrolled by human thought—**but it nonetheless exhibits characteristics of human design and intentionality: it is created to meet human interests, to satisfy human desires, and to maximize human good**. Consider again my examples of human attempts to heal damaged natural areas. **A forest is replanted to correct the damage of a fire because humans want the benefits of the forest**—whether these be timber, a habitat for wildlife, or protection of a watershed. **The replanting of the forest by humans is different from a natural re-growth of the forest vegetation, which would take much longer**. The forest is replanted because humans want the beneficial results of the mature forest in a shorter time. Similarly, **the eroded beach is replenished—with sand pumped from the ocean floor several miles offshore**—because the human community does not want to maintain the natural status of the beach. The eroded beach threatens oceanfront homes and recreational beaches. **Humanity prefers to restore the human benefits of a fully protected beach. The restored beach** will resemble the original, but it **will be the product of human technology, a humanly designed artifact for the promotion of human interests**. After these actions of human restoration and modification, **what emerges is a Nature with a different character than the original.** This is an ontological difference**, a difference in the essential qualities of the restored area. A beach that is replenished by human technology possesses a different essence than a beach created by natural forces** such as wind and tides. **A savanna replanted** from wildflower seeds and weeds collected by human hands **has a different essence** than grassland that develops on its own. **The source of these new areas is different—man—made, technological, artificial. The restored Nature is not really Nature at all**. **A Nature healed by human action is thus not Nature. As an artifact, it is designed to meet human purposes and needs—perhaps even the need for areas that look like a pristine, untouched Nature. In using our scientific and technological knowledge to restore natural areas,** we actually practice another form of domination. **We use our power to mold the natural world into a shape that is more amenable to our desires. We oppress the natural processes that function independent of human power; we prevent the autonomous development of the natural world. To believe that we heal or restore the natural world by the exercise of our technological power is, at best, a self-deception and, at worst, a rationalization for the continued degradation of Nature— for if we can heal the damage we inflict we will face no limits to our activities**. This conclusion has serious implications for the idea that Nature can repair human destruction, that Nature can somehow heal the evil that humans perpetuate on the earth. Just as a restored human landscape has a different causal history than the original natural system, **the reemergence of Nature in a place of human genocide and destruction is based on a series of human events that cannot be erased.** The natural vegetation that covers the mass grave in the Warsaw cemetery is not the same as the vegetation that would have grown there if the mass grave had never been dug**. The grass and trees in the cemetery have a different cause, a different history, that is inextricably linked to the history of the Holocaust. The grassy field** in the Majdanek parade ground does not cover and heal the mud and desolation of the death camp—it rather grows **from the dirt and ashes of the site's victims.** For anyone who has an understanding of the Holocaust, of the innumerable evils heaped upon an oppressed people by the Nazi regime, the richness of Nature cannot obliterate nor heal the horror. In this essay **I** question the environmentalists' concern for the restoration of nature and **argue against the optimistic view that humanity has the obligation and ability to repair or reconstruct damaged natural systems**. **This conception of** environmental **policy** and environmental **ethics is based on a misperception of natural reality and a misguided understanding of the human place in the natural environment**. On a simple level, **it is the same kind of "technological fix" that has engendered the environmental crisis. Human** science and **tech**nology **will fix, repair, and improve natural processes**. On a deeper level, **it is an expression of an anthropocentric world view, in which human interests shape and redesign a comfortable natural reality. A "restored" nature is an artifact created to meet human satisfactions** and interests. Thus, **on the most fundamental level, it is an unrecognized manifestation of the insidious dream of the human domination of nature. Once and for all, humanity will demonstrate its mastery of nature by "restoring" and repairing the degraded ecosystems of the biosphere. Cloaked in an environmental consciousness, human power will reign supreme.**

#### Oil drilling investment promotion has led to each world war—empirical imperialism backlash

Boyle 12

(Francis Boyle professor of international law at the University Of Illinois College Of Law, “Unlimited Imperialism and the Threat of World War III. U.S. Militarism at the Start of the 21st Century The Legacy of Two World Wars”, December 25 2012, Global Research, http://www.globalresearch.ca/unlimited-imperialism-and-the-threat-of-world-war-iii-u-s-militarism-at-the-start-of-the-21st-century/5316852)

Historically, this latest eruption of American militarism at the start of the 21st Century is akin to that of America opening the 20th Century by means of the U.S.-instigated Spanish-American War in 1898. Then the Republican administration of President William McKinley stole their colonial empire from Spain in Cuba, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines; inflicted a near genocidal war against the Filipino people; while at the same time illegally annexing the Kingdom of Hawaii and subjecting the Native Hawaiian people (who call themselves the Kanaka Maoli) to near genocidal conditions. Additionally, McKinley’s military and colonial expansion into the Pacific was also designed to secure America’s economic exploitation of China pursuant to the euphemistic rubric of the “open door” policy. But over the next four decades America’s aggressive presence, policies, and practices in the “Pacific” would ineluctably pave the way for Japan’s attack at Pearl Harbor on Dec. 7, 194l, and thus America’s precipitation into the ongoing Second World War. Today a century later the serial imperial aggressions launched and menaced by the Republican Bush Jr. administration and now the Democratic Obama administration are threatening to set off World War III. By shamelessly exploiting the terrible tragedy of 11 September 2001, the Bush Jr. administration set forth to steal a hydrocarbon empire from the Muslim states and peoples living in Central Asia and the Persian Gulf and Africa under the bogus pretexts of (1) fighting a war against international terrorism; and/or (2) eliminating weapons of mass destruction; and/or (3) the promotion of democracy; and/or (4) self-styled “humanitarian intervention”/responsibility to protect. Only this time the geopolitical stakes are infinitely greater than they were a century ago: control and domination of two-thirds of the world’s hydrocarbon resources and thus the very fundament and energizer of the global economic system – oil and gas. The Bush Jr./ Obama administrations have already targeted the remaining hydrocarbon reserves of Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia for further conquest or domination, together with the strategic choke-points at sea and on land required for their transportation. In this regard, the Bush Jr. administration announced the establishment of the U.S. Pentagon’s Africa Command (AFRICOM) in order to better control, dominate, and exploit both the natural resources and the variegated peoples of the continent of Africa, the very cradle of our human species. Libya and the Libyans became the first victims to succumb to AFRICOM under the Obama administration. They will not be the last. This current bout of U.S. imperialism is what Hans Morgenthau denominated “unlimited imperialism” in his seminal work Politics Among Nations (4th ed. 1968, at 52-53): “The outstanding historic examples of unlimited imperialism are the expansionist policies of Alexander the Great, Rome, the Arabs in the seventh and eighth centuries, Napoleon I, and Hitler. They all have in common an urge toward expansion which knows no rational limits, feeds on its own successes and, if not stopped by a superior force, will go on to the confines of the political world. This urge will not be satisfied so long as there remains anywhere a possible object of domination–a politically organized group of men which by its very independence challenges the conqueror’s lust for power. It is, as we shall see, exactly the lack of moderation, the aspiration to conquer all that lends itself to conquest, characteristic of unlimited imperialism, which in the past has been the undoing of the imperialistic policies of this kind… “ It is the Unlimited Imperialists along the lines of Alexander, Rome, Napoleon and Hitler who are now in charge of conducting American foreign policy. The factual circumstances surrounding the outbreaks of both the First World War and the Second World War currently hover like twin Swords of Damocles over the heads of all humanity.

## Relations

**No terrorism threat** from Hezbollah

Bensman, 2009 (Todd, instructor at Texas University, two time National press club award winner, Master of Arts degree from University of Missouri School of Jouranlism, “Iran reaches out to Mexico,” “Iran reaches out to Mexico,” April 9, 2009

<http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/mexico/090407/iran-reaches-out-mexico>)

#### Iran's Mexico City-stationed ambassador, Mohammad Hassan Ghariri Abyaneh, did not return repeated phone calls. But an assistant told GlobalPost that he, like President Obama next week, will be meeting with Mexican President Felipe Calderon.¶ The inroads may come to nothing, however. Mario Loyola, a former U.S. Senate and Pentagon advisor who is now a national security expert at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies, predicted the Mexicans would ultimately snub the Iranian proposal.¶ "There just isn't any upside in the Iranian proposal for a conservative government like president Calderon's, which values its relations with the U.S. and looks at things our way," Loyola said. "The Mexicans will certainly avoid insulting the Iranians, but they will also avoid get(ting) mixed up in any sort of shady business with them. Calderon's advisors will advise him to avoid any changes in the tenor or nature of Mexican-Iranian relations."

#### No chance of terror attack---too tough to execute

John Mueller and Mark G. Stewart 12, Senior Research Scientist at the Mershon Center for International Security Studies and Adjunct Professor in the Department of Political Science, both at Ohio State University, and Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute AND Australian Research Council Professorial Fellow and Professor and Director at the Centre for Infrastructure Performance and Reliability at the University of Newcastle, "The Terrorism Delusion," Summer, International Security, Vol. 37, No. 1, politicalscience.osu.edu/faculty/jmueller//absisfin.pdf

In 2009, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) issued a lengthy report on protecting the homeland. Key to achieving such an objective should be a careful assessment of the character, capacities, and desires of potential terrorists targeting that homeland. Although the report contains a section dealing with what its authors call “the nature of the terrorist adversary,” the section devotes only two sentences to assessing that nature: “The number and high profile of international and domestic terrorist attacks and disrupted plots during the last two decades underscore the determination and persistence of terrorist organizations. Terrorists have proven to be relentless, patient, opportunistic, and flexible, learning from experience and modifying tactics and targets to exploit perceived vulnerabilities and avoid observed strengths.”8¶ This description may apply to some terrorists somewhere, including at least a few of those involved in the September 11 attacks. Yet, it scarcely describes the vast majority of those individuals picked up on terrorism charges in the United States since those attacks. The inability of the DHS to consider this fact even parenthetically in its fleeting discussion is not only amazing but perhaps delusional in its single-minded preoccupation with the extreme.¶ In sharp contrast, the authors of the case studies, with remarkably few exceptions, describe their subjects with such words as incompetent, ineffective, unintelligent, idiotic, ignorant, inadequate, unorganized, misguided, muddled, amateurish, dopey, unrealistic, moronic, irrational, and foolish.9 And in nearly all of the cases where an operative from the police or from the Federal Bureau of Investigation was at work (almost half of the total), the most appropriate descriptor would be “gullible.”¶ In all, as Shikha Dalmia has put it, would-be terrorists need to be “radicalized enough to die for their cause; Westernized enough to move around without raising red flags; ingenious enough to exploit loopholes in the security apparatus; meticulous enough to attend to the myriad logistical details that could torpedo the operation; self-sufficient enough to make all the preparations without enlisting outsiders who might give them away; disciplined enough to maintain complete secrecy; and—above all—psychologically tough enough to keep functioning at a high level without cracking in the face of their own impending death.”10 The case studies examined in this article certainly do not abound with people with such characteristics. ¶ In the eleven years since the September 11 attacks, no terrorist has been able to detonate even a primitive bomb in the United States, and except for the four explosions in the London transportation system in 2005, neither has any in the United Kingdom. Indeed, the only method by which Islamist terrorists have managed to kill anyone in the United States since September 11 has been with gunfire—inflicting a total of perhaps sixteen deaths over the period (cases 4, 26, 32).11 This limited capacity is impressive because, at one time, small-scale terrorists in the United States were quite successful in setting off bombs. Noting that the scale of the September 11 attacks has “tended to obliterate America’s memory of pre-9/11 terrorism,” Brian Jenkins reminds us (and we clearly do need reminding) that the 1970s witnessed sixty to seventy terrorist incidents, mostly bombings, on U.S. soil every year.12¶ The situation seems scarcely different in Europe and other Western locales. Michael Kenney, who has interviewed dozens of government officials and intelligence agents and analyzed court documents, has found that, in sharp contrast with the boilerplate characterizations favored by the DHS and with the imperatives listed by Dalmia, Islamist militants in those locations are operationally unsophisticated, short on know-how, prone to making mistakes, poor at planning, and limited in their capacity to learn.13 Another study documents the difficulties of network coordination that continually threaten the terrorists’ operational unity, trust, cohesion, and ability to act collectively.14¶ In addition, although some of the plotters in the cases targeting the United States harbored visions of toppling large buildings, destroying airports, setting off dirty bombs, or bringing down the Brooklyn Bridge (cases 2, 8, 12, 19, 23, 30, 42), all were nothing more than wild fantasies, far beyond the plotters’ capacities however much they may have been encouraged in some instances by FBI operatives. Indeed, in many of the cases, target selection is effectively a random process, lacking guile and careful planning. Often, it seems, targets have been chosen almost capriciously and simply for their convenience. For example, a would-be bomber targeted a mall in Rockford, Illinois, because it was nearby (case 21). Terrorist plotters in Los Angeles in 2005 drew up a list of targets that were all within a 20-mile radius of their shared apartment, some of which did not even exist (case 15). In Norway, a neo-Nazi terrorist on his way to bomb a synagogue took a tram going the wrong way and dynamited a mosque instead.15

#### Terrorism is not located in one particular country or group – its a consequence of the new global order, which creates constant internal violence. Their supposed solution plays into the mindset that justifies terrorist acts.

Baudrillard in 03 (Jean, October, “The Mind of Terrorism” 2003)

All the speeches and commentaries made since September 11 betray a gigantic post-traumatic abreaction both to the event itself and to the fascination that it exerts. The moral condemnation anti the sacred union against terrorism are directly proportional to the prodigious jubilation felt at having seen this global superpower destroyed, because it was this insufferable superpower that gave rise both to the violence now spreading throughout the world and to the terrorist imagination that (without our knowing it) dwells within us all.¶ That the entire world without exception had dreamed of this event, that nobody could help but dream the destruction of so powerful a hegemon-this fact is unacceptable to the moral conscience of the West, and yet it is a fact nonetheless, a fact that resists the emotional violence of all the rhetoric conspiring to erase it.¶ In the end, it was they who did it but we who wished it. If we do not take this fact into account, the vent loses all symbolic dimension; it becomes s a purely arbitrary act, the murderous phantasmagoria of a few fanatics that we need only repress. But we know well that such is not tie case. Without our profound complicity the event would not have reverberated so forcefully, and in their strategic symbolism the terrorists knew they could count on this unconfessable complicity.¶ It goes well beyond the hatred that the desolate and the exploited-those who ended up on the wrong side of the new world order-feel toward the dominant global power. This malicious desire resides n the hearts of even those who've shared in the spoils. The allergy to absolute order, to absolute power, is universal, and the two towers of the World Trade Center were, precisely because of their ideaticality, the perfect incarnation of this absolute order.¶ Countless disaster films have borne witness to these fantasies, and the universal appeal of the images shows just how close the fantasies always are to being acted out: the closer the entire system gets to perfection or to omnipotence, the stronger the urge to destroy it grows.¶ When the world has been so thoroughly monopolized, when power has been so formidably consolidated by the technocratic machine and the dogma of globalization, what means of turning the tables remains besides terrorism? In dealing all the cards to itself, the system forced the Other to change the rules of the game. And the new rules are ferocious, because the game is ferocious. Terrorism is the act that restores an irreducible singularity to the heart of a generalized system of exchange. All those singularities (species, individuals, cultures) that have been sacrificed to the interests of a global system of commerce avenge themselves by turning the tables with terrorism.¶ Terror against terror-this is no longer an ideological notion. We have gone well beyond ideology and politics, The energy that nourishes terror, no ideology, no cause, not even an Islamic one, can explain. The terrorists are not aiming simply to transform the world. Like the heretics of previous times, they aim to radicalize the world through sacrifice, whereas the system aims to convert: it into money through force.¶ Terrorists, like viruses, are everywhere. There is no longer a boundary that can hem terrorism in; it is at the heart of the very culture it's fighting with, and the visible fracture (and the hatred) that pits the exploited and underdeveloped nations of the world against the West masks the dominant system's internal fractures. It is as if every means of domination secreted its own antidote. Against this almost automatic from of resistance to its power, the system can do nothing. **Terrorism is the shock wave of this silent resistance**.¶ It is a mistake, then, to characterize this as a clash of civilizations or of religions. It goes well beyond Islam aria' America, on which one aright be tempted to concentrate in order to create the illusion of a confrontation resolvable by force. There is a fundamental antagonism at work. but it transcends the phantom of America (which is perhaps the epicenter though not the incarnation of globalization) as well as the phantom of Islam (which likewise is not the incarnation of terrorism). **This is the clash of triumphant globalization at war with itself**. In this sense, it is accurate to speak of this as a world war-no: the third but the fourth-and the only one that is truly global, since what's at stake is globalization itself. The first put an end to European supremacy and to the era of colonialism; the second put an end to Nazism; and the third to Communism. Each one brought us progressively closer to the single world order of today, which is now nearing its end, everywhere opposed, everywhere grappling with hostile forces. This is a war of fractal complexity, waged worldwide against rebellious singularities that, in the manner of antibodies, mount a resistance in every cell. These confrontations are so imperceptible that it is occasionally necessary to resuscitate the idea of war by staging spectacular scenes such as those in the Persian Gulf and now in Afghanistan. But World War IV happens elsewhere too. **It haunts all expressions of world order, all forms of hegemonic domination**-if Islam were dominating the world, terrorism would rise up against Islam. **The globe itself is resistant to globalization**.¶ Terrorism is immoral. The occurrence at the World Trade Center, this symbolic act of defiance, is immoral, but it was in response to globalization, which is itself immoral. We are therefore immoral ourselves, so if we hope to understand anything we will need to get beyond Good and Evil. The crucial point lies in precisely the opposite direction from the Enlightenment philosophy of Good and Evil. We naively believe in the progress of Good, that its ascendance in all domains (science, technology, democracy, human rights) corresponds to the defeat of Evil. No one seems to have understood that Good and Evil increase in power at the same time -and in the same way. The triumph of one does not result in the obliteration of the ether; to the contrary. We tend to regard Evil, metaphysically, as an accidental smudge, but this axiom is illusory. Good does not reduce Evil, or vice versa; they are at once irreducible, the one and the other, and inextricably linked. In the end, **Good cannot vanquish Evil except by denying to be Good, since, in monopolizing global power, it entails a backfire of proportional violence.**¶ **In the traditional universe, there remained a balance of Good and Evil**, a dialectical relationship that guaranteed, for better or worse, the tension and equilibrium of the moral universe. This balance was lost as soon as there was a total extrapolation of Good-the hegemony of the positive over every form of negativity. From that moment, **the equilibrium was broken, and Evil returned to an invisible autonomy, increasing exponentially**.¶ Relatively speaking, this is a bit like what happened to the political order after Communism disappeared and neoliberal forces triumphed worldwide. It was then **that a phantom enemy arose, percolating throughout the planet, rising up through all the cracks in power**. Islam. But Islam. is merely the crystallized form of this antagonism. The antagonism is everywhere, and it is in each of us. Hence, terror against terror. But it is asymmetrical terror, and it is this asymmetry that leaves the absolute global power disarmed. It can do nothing but strike at its own rationale for the balance of power, without being able to compete on the playing field of symbolic defiance and of death, having deleted that playing field from its own culture.¶ Until now, this integrating power had succeeded in absorbing and reabsorbing every attack, every negativity, and in doing so created a thoroughly hopeless situation (not only for the wretched o' the earth but also for the privileged and well-to-do in their radical comfort). But the terrorists have started using their own deaths offensively and effectively, based on a strategic intuition, a sense of their adversary's immense fragility, of the system's quasi-perfection, of the explosion that would erupt at the slightest spark. They succeeded in turning their deaths into an ultimate weapon against a system devoted to the ideal of zero losses. **Any system of zero losses is a zero-sum game. And all methods of deterrence and destruction can do nothing against an enemy who has already turned his death into a counteroffensive weapon.** (" Who cares about the American bombing! Our men are as eager to die as the Americans are eager to live!") Thus the imbalance of more than 3,000 deaths inflicted in one fell swoop against a system of zero losses. Here, everything depends upon death, not only upon the brutal irruption of death live and in real time but upon the irruption of a death much more than real: a symbolic and sacrificial death-which is to say, the absolute, ultimate, unappealable event.

#### Their repetition of the official terrorist threat narrative functions to legitimize counterterrorism.

London, 9

(Sam, Raphael, Senior Lecturer in International Relations at Kingston University, Critical Terrorism Studies: A New Research Agenda, ed. Jackson, Smyth, and Gunning, p. 62-64, GAL)

Through replicating official analyses of the terrorist threat facing the US and its allies, and through failing to acknowledge the role that US-led 'counterterrorism' policies have played in sustaining and promoting terrorism in the South, the liter­ature has long worked to legitimize these policies. This has been so as a result of omission or the silencing of a great deal of facts and perspectives relevant to the study of terrorism as well as more overt policy prescriptions laid out by the experts. This was evident during the cold war when the experts tended to recom­mend a wide set of coercive interventions in the region, broadly aligned to those undertaken by the US government. For instance. Kupperman was clear that:

If (arresting suspects and diplomatic sanctions on sponsors) were to fail, which is quite likely, the administration must then confront the problems of using covert force, including eliminating the bombers and their leaders. If such operations were to be undertaken. Congress must share responsibility. Other­wise, another 'Iran-Contra' debacle would assuredly arise. If covert operations, in particular assassination by executive order, remain proscribed, certain allied secret services would be less squeamish. In any case, the terrorists must be sent a clear message.

#### Counterterrorism fails and creates a self-fulfilling prophecy- their assertions are tautological, untestable and rely on faith in secret information.

Jackson 12, Director at the National Center for Peace and Conflict Studies, 12

(Richard, February 6, Reader in the Department of International Politics @ Aberystwyth University, “Does Counter-terrorism work? Or, counter-terrorism as divination…” <http://richardjacksonterrorismblog.wordpress.com/2012/02/06/does-counter-terrorism-work-or-counter-terrorism-as-divination/>, accessed 7/3/12, CPO)

Imagine that one day Counter-terrorism officers appear on television and announce that to keep evil terrorists at bay – to protect us from the cancer of terrorism which daily haunts us – every family is required to leave a saucer of milk out by the nearest fence-post on a Wednesday at dusk, while chanting the words ‘numpty, numpty, noo noo’ precisely seven times. The Counter-terrorist official goes on to assert that this ritual must be done every week, indefinitely, because it is the only way to keep us safe from terrorism. Of course, most people would consider this to be a little bit insane, to say the least, and would naturally ask: what evidence or information do you have exactly, Mr Counter-terrorist, to suggest that this will remotely work? What is your counter-terrorist theory based on? What is the logic and evidence you are basing this on?¶ While this is a humorous scenario, it is only slightly alarming that this is actually an accurate description of how counter-terrorism has come to work in the era of the war on terror. For the past ten years at least, we have been told that terrorism is a massive, evil force which is inevitable in this day and age – it is only a matter of when, not if a terrorist attack will take place. Terrorists are everywhere and can strike at any time and with any weapon. The only way to control terrorism is to spend billions of dollars improving security in public places, increase surveillance on all people at all times, get rid of legal protections for suspects, make everyone prove their identity, bring in harsh new laws, dispatch drones to kill hundreds of nameless people in foreign lands, torture suspects for information, kidnap and render people to secret prisons around the world, encourage people to spy on their neighbours, watch what we talk or read about lest we glorify terrorism, and much more besides. Moreover, we are told that these security rituals will have to be observed pretty much forever, because the threat of terrorism will never end, and we must include counter-terrorism in ever more areas of modern life because terrorism is spreading.¶ As before, the questions we should ask are: what evidence or information do you have, Mr Counter-terrorist, to suggest that this will in any way work – that it will actually make us safe from the evil scourge of terrorism? What is your counter-terrorist theory based on? What logic and evidence are you basing this on?¶ The alarming fact is that most counter-terrorism today is not based on theories and actual evidence, nor is it rooted in a historical or theoretical understanding of terrorism as a form of political violence. Significantly, not a single government since 9/11 has conducted a major study to examine whether the measures they have undertaken and the billions they have spent have either worked effectively to prevent terrorism, provides value for money, or could have been achieved some other less costly way. In reality, they are spending all that money and undertaking all those measures purely on faith. At the same time, scholars have also been very lax in studying whether counter-terrorism measures actually work, or how well they work; there are very few empirically-based studies on the effectiveness of different counter-terrorism measures. Interestingly, the few studies that have been done have concluded that either they don’t work (this is the case for security measures such as extra screening at airports, for example; these measures have a displacement effect, which means that terrorists tend to choose other less well-guarded targets), or importantly, they are actually counter-productive (this is the case for measures like targeted killings, for example, which tend to increase the number of recruits for terrorist groups).¶ In fact, most counter-terrorism during the last ten years of war on terror, as Joseba Zulaika has so eloquently shown, has been a self-fulfilling prophesy: actions undertaken which produce the very thing it is designed to destroy. We went to war against Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia **and elsewhere, tortured, assassinated and rendered thousands of suspected terrorists**, all to prevent terrorism, while simultaneously knowing that it would most likely produce more terrorism (as foreign military intervention usually does) – which would then in turn, necessitate more counter-terrorism. On a smaller scale, FBI agents go out and encourage disaffected individuals to undertake terrorist operations, and then arrest them before they can undertake their plot – with massive publicity about ‘foiled plots’.¶ Importantly (and a little insanely), the sequence of events which occurs is then used as proof of the original assertion: ‘See, there are terrorists in Iraq/Pakistan/Yemen/Somalia, which is why we had to go there to fight them’; ‘See, there are terrorists within America who want to kill US citizens.’ In other words, we are told that we have to follow the prescriptions of the counter-terrorist, knowing that it will produce the very terrorism it is designed to counter, which will then justify further counter-terrorism measures.¶ The interesting thing is that this kind of tautological, mystical thinking and this kind of self-confirming behavior is what, so anthropologists tell us, characterizes the thinking and practices of divination and witchcraft. In a sense, counter-terrorists have become oracles or shamans in our society: they rely on secret knowledge, they tell us how to ritually fight the evil of terrorism, and they can never be tested or proven wrong. Their predictions and assertions do not require scientific validation or confirmation; instead, they tell us what to do to prevent terrorism and if no terrorism occurs, they claim they were therefore right to prescribe such measures. If terrorism does occur, they can also claim they were right about the danger of terrorism, and that more clearly needs to be done to counter it. In other words, there is no real (logical or empirical) way to prove a diviner or an oracle wrong. In the end, all we can do is to keep putting out the milk by the fencepost and chant, ‘numpty, numpty, noo noo’ while the sun sets on our civil liberties and freedoms…

Their view of the Middle East is flawed as long as they remain in the Orientalist mindset. This turns the case.

Said 76 (Edward, Prof. of English/Comparative Lit., Columbia U., “Introduction.” Orientalism. Page 26-27)

One aspect of the electronic, postmodern world is that there has been a reinforcement of the stereotypes by which the Orient is viewed. Television, the films, and all the media’s resources have forced information into more and more standardized molds. So far as the Orient is concerned, standardization and cultural stereotyping have intensified the hold of the nineteenth-century academic and imaginative demonology of “the mysterious Orient.” This is nowhere more true that in the ways by which the Near east is grasped. Three things have contributed to making even the simplest perception of the Arabs and Islam into a highly politicized, almost raucous matter: one, the history of popular anti-Arab and anti-Islamic prejudice in the West, which is immediately reflected in the history of Orientalism; two, the struggle between the Arabs and Israeli Zionism, and its effects upon American Jews as well as upon both the liberal culture and the population at large; three, the almost total absence of any cultural position making it possible either to identify with or dispassionately to discuss the Arabs or Islam. Furthermore, it hardly needs saying that because the Middle east is now so identified with Great Power politics, oil economics, and the simple-minded dichotomy of freedom-loving, democratic Israel and evil, totalitarian, and terroristic Arabs, the chances of anything like a clear view of what one talks about in talking about the near east are depressingly small.

#### China is painted as a threat not because we have an objective understanding but because it fits within our definition of ourselves and justifies US power politics. These constant predictions of war leave no choice but to prepare for war—turning their advantage.

#### Vote Neg to reject these representations—allowing for a more effective foreign policy.

**Pan, 04’** (Political Science, Australian National U, Chengxin, Department of Political Science at Australian National University, “The ‘China Threat’ in American Self-Imagination: The Discursive Construction of Other as Power Politics”, Alternatives, June-July, ebscohost)

I have argued above that **the "China threat" argument in mainstream U.S. IR literature is derived, primarily, from a discursive construction of otherness. This construction is predicated on a particular narcissistic understanding of the U.S. self and on a positivist-based realism, concerned with absolute certainty and security, a concern central to the dominant U.S. self-imaginary. Within these frameworks, it seems imperative that China be treated as a threatening, absolute other since it is unable to fit neatly into the U.S.-led evolutionary scheme or guarantee absolute security for the United States, so that U.S. power preponderance in the post-Cold War world can still be legitimated. Not only does this reductionist representation come at the expense of understanding China as a dynamic, multifaceted country but it leads inevitably to a policy of containment that, in turn, tends to enhance the influence of realpolitik thinking, nationalist extremism, and hard-line stance in today's China**. Even a small dose of the containment strategy is likely to have a highly dramatic impact on U.S.-China relations, as the 1995-1996 missile crisis and the 2001 spy-plane incident have vividly attested. In this respect, Chalmers Johnson is right when he suggests that "a policy of containment toward China implies the possibility of war, just as it did during the Cold War vis-a-vis the former Soviet Union. The balance of terror prevented war between the United States and the Soviet Union, but this may not work in the case of China."^^ For instance, as the United States presses ahead with a missile defence shield to "guarantee" its invulnerability from rather unlikely sources of missile attacks, it would be almost certain to intensify China's sense of vulnerability and compel it to expand its current small nuclear arsenal so as to maintain the efficiency of its limited deterrence. In consequence, it is not impossible that the two countries, and possibly the whole region, might be dragged into an escalating arms race that would eventually make war more likely. **Neither the United States nor China is likely to be keen on fighting the other. But as has been demonstrated, the "China threat" argument, for all its alleged desire for peace and security, tends to make war preparedness the most "realistic" option for both sides**. At this juncture, worthy of note is an interesting comment made by Charlie Neuhauser, a leading CIA China specialist. on the Vietnam War, a war fought by the United States to contain the then-Communist "other." Neuhauser says, "Nobody wants it. We don't want it, Ho Chi Minh doesn't want it; it's simply a question of annoying the other side."94 And, as we know, in an unwanted war some fifty-eight thousand young people from the United States and an estimated two million Vietnamese men, women, and children lost their lives. **Therefore, to call for a halt to the vicious circle of theory as practice associated with the "China threat" literature, tinkering with the current positivist-dominated U.S. IR scholarship on China is no longer adequate. Rather, what is needed is to question this un-self-reflective scholarship itself, particularly its connections with the dominant way in which the United States and the West in general represent themselves and others via their positivist epistemology, so that alternative, more nuanced, and less dangerous ways of interpreting and debating China might become possible**.

#### Their attempt to know China makes conflict inevitable – the threat only exists because of their discourse

Pan, 4

Chengxin [Department of Political Science and International Relations, Faculty of Arts, Australian National University, “The "China threat" in American self-imagination: the discursive construction of other as power politics”, Alternatives]

I have argued above that **the "China threat" argument in mainstream U.S. IR literature is derived, primarily, from a discursive construction of otherness. This construction is predicated on a particular narcissistic understanding of the U.S. self and on a positivist-based realism, concerned with absolute certainty and security, a concern central to the dominant U.S. self-imaginary**. Within these frameworks, it seems imperative that China be treated as a threatening, absolute other since it is unable to fit neatly into the U.S.-led evolutionary scheme or guarantee absolute security for the United States, so that U.S. power preponderance in the post-Cold War world can still be legitimated. **Not only does this reductionist representation come at the expense of understanding China as a dynamic, multifaceted country but it leads inevitably to a policy of containment that, in turn, tends to enhance the influence of realpolitik thinking, nationalist extremism, and hard-line stance in today's China. Even a small dose of the containment strategy is likely to have a highly dramatic impact on U.S.-China relations**, as the 1995-1996 missile crisis and the 2001 spy-plane incident have vividly attested. In this respect, Chalmers Johnson is right when he suggests that "a policy of containment toward China implies the possibility of war, just as it did during the Cold War vis-a-vis the former Soviet Union. The balance of terror prevented war between the United States and the Soviet Union, but this may not work in the case of China." (93) For instance, as the United States presses ahead with a missile-defence shield to "guarantee" its invulnerability from rather unlikely sources of missile attacks, it would be almost certain to intensify China's sense of vulnerability and compel it to expand its current small nuclear arsenal so as to maintain the efficiency of its limited deterrence. In consequence, it is not impossible that the two countries, and possibly the whole region, might be dragged into an escalating arms race that would eventually make war more likely. Neither the United States nor China is likely to be keen on fighting the other. But as has been demonstrated, the "China threat" argument, for all its alleged desire for peace and security, tends to make war preparedness the most "realistic" option for both sides. At this juncture, worthy of note is an interesting comment made by Charlie Neuhauser, a leading CIA China specialist, on the Vietnam War, a war fought by the United States to contain the then-Communist "other." Neuhauser says, "Nobody wants it. We don't want it, Ho Chi Minh doesn't want it; it's simply a question of annoying the other side." (94) And, as we know, in an unwanted war some fifty-eight thousand young people from the United States and an estimated two million Vietnamese men, women, and children lost their lives. Therefore, **to call for a halt to the vicious circle of theory as practice associated with the "China threat" literature, tinkering with the current positivist-dominated U.S. IR scholarship on China is no longer adequate**. Rather, **what is needed is to question this un-self-reflective scholarship itself, particularly its connections with the dominant way in which the United States and the West in general represent themselves and others via their positivist epistemology, so that alternative, more nuanced, and less dangerous ways of interpreting and debating China might become possible**.