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#### Obama is pushing Congress to resolve the debt ceiling --- political capital is key.

Pace 9/12

Julie, AP White House correspondent, Syria debate on hold, Obama refocuses on agenda, The Fresno Bee, 9/12/13, http://www.fresnobee.com/2013/09/12/3493538/obama-seeks-to-focus-on-domestic.html

With a military strike against Syria on hold, President Barack Obama tried Thursday to reignite momentum for his second-term domestic agenda. But his progress could hinge on the strength of his standing on Capitol Hill after what even allies acknowledge were missteps in the latest foreign crisis.¶ "It is still important to recognize that we have a lot of things left to do here in this government," Obama told his Cabinet, starting a sustained White House push to refocus the nation on matters at home as key benchmarks on the budget and health care rapidly approach.¶ "The American people are still interested in making sure that our kids are getting the kind of education they deserve, that we are putting people back to work," Obama said.¶ The White House plans to use next week's five-year anniversary of the 2008 financial collapse to warn Republicans that shutting down the government or failing to raise the debt limit could drag down the still-fragile economy. With Hispanic Heritage Month to begin Monday, Obama is also expected to press for a stalled immigration overhaul and urge minorities to sign up for health care exchanges beginning Oct. 1.¶ Among the events planned for next week is a White House ceremony highlighting Americans working on immigrant and citizenship issues. Administration officials will also promote overhaul efforts at naturalization ceremonies across the country. On Sept. 21, Obama will speak at the Congressional Black Caucus Gala, where he'll trumpet what the administration says are benefits of the president's health care law for African-Americans and other minorities.¶ Two major factors are driving Obama's push to get back on track with domestic issues after three weeks of Syria dominating the political debate. Polls show the economy, jobs and health care remain Americans' top concerns. And Obama has a limited window to make progress on those matters in a second term, when lame-duck status can quickly creep up on presidents, particularly if they start losing public support.¶ Obama already is grappling with some of the lowest approval ratings of his presidency. A Pew Research Center/USA Today poll out this week put his approval at 44 percent. That's down from 55 percent at the end of 2012.¶ Potential military intervention in Syria also is deeply unpopular with many Americans, with a Pew survey finding that 63 percent opposing the idea. And the president's publicly shifting positions on how to respond to a deadly chemical weapons attack in Syria also have confused many Americans and congressional lawmakers.¶ "In times of crisis, the more clarity the better," said Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., a strong supporter of U.S. intervention in Syria. "This has been confusing. For those who are inclined to support the president, it's been pretty hard to nail down what the purpose of a military strike is."¶ For a time, the Obama administration appeared to be barreling toward an imminent strike in retaliation for the Aug. 21 chemical weapons attack. But Obama made a sudden reversal and instead decided to seek congressional approval for military action.¶ Even after administration officials briefed hundreds of lawmakers on classified intelligence, there appeared to be limited backing for a use-of-force resolution on Capitol Hill. Rather than face defeat, Obama asked lawmakers this week to postpone any votes while the U.S. explores the viability of a deal to secure Syria's chemical weapons stockpiles.¶ That pause comes as a relief to Obama and many Democrats eager to return to issues more in line with the public's concerns. The most pressing matters are a Sept. 30 deadline to approve funding to keep the government open — the new fiscal year begins Oct. 1 — and the start of sign-ups for health care exchanges, a crucial element of the health care overhaul.¶ On Wednesday, a revolt by tea party conservatives forced House Republican leaders to delay a vote on a temporary spending bill written to head off a government shutdown. Several dozen staunch conservatives are seeking to couple the spending bill with a provision to derail implementation of the health care law.¶ The White House also may face a fight with Republicans over raising the nation's debt ceiling this fall. While Obama has insisted he won't negotiate over the debt limit, House Speaker John Boehner on Thursday said the GOP will insist on curbing spending.

#### Economic engagement is unpopular – costs PC

NYT 13

New York Times. “In Latin America, U.S. Focus Shifts From Drug War to Economy” May 4, 2013. http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/05/world/americas/in-latin-america-us-shifts-focus-from-drug-war-to-economy.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=1&

Last week, Mr. Obama returned to capitals in Latin America with a vastly different message. Relationships with countries racked by drug violence and organized crime should focus more on economic development and less on the endless battles against drug traffickers and organized crime capos that have left few clear victors. The countries, Mexico in particular, need to set their own course on security, with the United States playing more of a backing role. That approach runs the risk of being seen as kowtowing to governments more concerned about their public image than the underlying problems tarnishing it. Mexico, which is eager to play up its economic growth, has mounted an aggressive effort to play down its crime problems, going as far as to encourage the news media to avoid certain slang words in reports. “The problem will not just go away,” said Michael Shifter, president of the Inter-American Dialogue. “It needs to be tackled head-on, with a comprehensive strategy that includes but goes beyond stimulating economic growth and alleviating poverty. “Obama becomes vulnerable to the charge of downplaying the region’s overriding issue, and the chief obstacle to economic progress,” he added. “It is fine to change the narrative from security to economics as long as the reality on the ground reflects and fits with the new story line.” Administration officials insist that Mr. Obama remains cleareyed about the security challenges, but the new emphasis corresponds with a change in focus by the Mexican government. The new Mexican president, Enrique Peña Nieto, took office in December vowing to reduce the violence that exploded under the militarized approach to the drug war adopted by his predecessor, Felipe Calderón. That effort left about 60,000 Mexicans dead and appears not to have significantly damaged the drug-trafficking industry. In addition to a focus on reducing violence, which some critics have interpreted as taking a softer line on the drug gangs, Mr. Peña Nieto has also moved to reduce American involvement in law enforcement south of the border. With friction and mistrust between American and Mexican law enforcement agencies growing, Mr. Obama suggested that the United States would no longer seek to dominate the security agenda. “It is obviously up to the Mexican people to determine their security structures and how it engages with other nations, including the United States,” he said, standing next to Mr. Peña Nieto on Thursday in Mexico City. “But the main point I made to the president is that we support the Mexican government’s focus on reducing violence, and we look forward to continuing our good cooperation in any way that the Mexican government deems appropriate.” In some ways, conceding leadership of the drug fight to Mexico hews to a guiding principle of Mr. Obama’s foreign policy, in which American supremacy is played down, at least publicly, in favor of a multilateral approach. But that philosophy could collide with the concerns of lawmakers in Washington, who have expressed frustration with what they see as a lack of clarity in Mexico’s security plans. And security analysts say the entrenched corruption in Mexican law enforcement has long clouded the partnership with their American counterparts. Putting Mexico in the driver’s seat on security marks a shift in a balance of power that has always tipped to the United States and, analysts said, will carry political risk as Congress negotiates an immigration bill that is expected to include provisions for tighter border security. “If there is a perception in the U.S. Congress that security cooperation is weakening, that could play into the hands of those who oppose immigration reform,” said Vanda Felbab-Brown, a counternarcotics expert at the Brookings Institution in Washington.

#### Debt ceiling causes Iran strikes

Nimmo 6

Kurt, Iran Attack: No Way Back Now, 1/18/6, http://www.uruknet.info/?p=m19768&l=i&size=1&hd=0

But none of this is relevant now. Israel will goad the United States—with the dumbfounded blessing of the Europeans (or their blue-blood rulers) and the ineffectual suck-up Security Council—into blasting the daylights out of Iran, probably killing thousands, if not eventually hundreds of thousands of innocent people. It appears all of this will go down in March, when "diplomacy" finally fails in the United Nations and, significantly, when America reaches its $8,184 trillion debt ceiling, thus forcing the nation (to the greedy glee of the criminal neolib financier class) into a spurt of military Keynesianism in order to jump-start the economy. Few seem to notice this is what happened in Germany in the 1930s and the result was fascism and mass misery and incomprehensible numbers of dead people. "Wars provide an economic boost but typically produce little of lasting value," notes [Gracchus Jones](http://www.waynemadsenreport.com/guest1.htm). "But in America today, there is no economic engine, and if there is one thing modern economic history proves, it is that you cannot have prosperity without one."

#### Nuclear war

Chossudovsky in 7

Michel, Professor of Economics, The Unthinkable: The US- Israeli Nuclear War on Iran, http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=viewArticle&code=CHO20070121&articleId=4536

The World is at the crossroads of the most serious crisis in modern history. The US has embarked on a military adventure, "a long war", which threatens the future of humanity. At no point since the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima on August 6th, 1945, has humanity been closer to the unthinkable, a nuclear holocaust which could potentially spread, in terms of radioactive fallout, over a large part of the Middle East. There is mounting evidence that the Bush Administration in liaison with Israel and NATO is planning the launching of a nuclear war against Iran, ironically, in retaliation for its nonexistent nuclear weapons program. The US-Israeli military operation is said to be in "an advanced state of readiness". If such a plan were to be launched, the war would escalate and eventually engulf the entire Middle-East Central Asian region. The war could extend beyond the region, as some analysts have suggested, ultimately leading us into a World War III scenario.
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**The aff is economic imperialism hidden by benevolence ---this encourages countervailing forces which turn the case.**

**Veltmeyer, ’11** - Professor of Development Studies at the Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas in Mexico and Professor of Sociology and International Development Studies at St. Mary’s University, (Henry, “US imperialism in Latin America: then and now, here and there,” estudios críticos del desarrollo, vol. I, núm. 1, segundo semestre de 2011, pp. 89–123, http://estudiosdeldesarrollo.net/critical/rev1/3.pdf)//A-Berg

Finding itself in the wake of a second world war as the dominant economic power in the «free world» the US strove assiduously to consolidate this power at the level of foreign policy. Under prevailing conditions that included the potential threat posed by the USSR and the fallout from a spreading and unstoppable decolonization movement in the economically backward areas of the world, United States (US) policymakers decided on, and actively pursued, a foreign policy with three pillars. One of these pillars was a strategy of economic reconstruction of an economically devastated Europe and the capitalist development of the economies and societies on the periphery of the system. A second pillar of the post–war order was what would become known as the «Bretton woods system», composed of three institutions (a Bank of Economic Reconstruction and Development—the World Bank today; the International Monetary fund; and a General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade that would morph into the WTO 50 years on) and the mechanism of the US dollar, based on a fixed gold standard, as the currency of international trade.1 The third pillar was would become the United Nations—a system of international organizations designed to provide the necessary conditions of (capitalist) development and collective security, a system of multilateral conflict resolution. The motivating force behind this foreign policy was clear enough: to advance the geopolitical and economic interests of the US as a world power, including considerations of profit and strategic security (to make the world save for US investments and to reactivate a capital accumulation process). It was to be an empire of free trade and capitalist development, plus democracy where possible, a system of capitalist democracies backed up by a system of international organizations dominated by the US, a military alliance (NATO) focused on Europe in the protection of US interests and collective security, and a more global network of military bases to provide logistical support for its global military apparatus. Within the institutional framework of this system and international order the US was particularly concerned to consolidate its power and influence in Latin America and the Caribbean, regarded by policymakers and many politicians as a legitimate sphere of undue influence—the exercise of state power in the «national interest». This chapter will elaborate on economic and political dynamics of the efforts pursued by the US to pursue these interests via the projection of state power—and the resulting «informal empire» constructed by default. US IMPERIALISM IN LATIN AMERICA—FORMS AND DYNAMICS The US has always been imperialistic in its approach to national development in Latin America, but in the wake of World War II the situation that it found itself in—commanding, it is estimated, half of the world’s industrial capacity and 80% of its financial resources; and already an occupying power of major proportions3—awakened in US policymaking circles and its foreign policy establishment its historic mission regarding the Americas and also the dream of world domination, provoking the quest to bring it about in the preferred form of an «informal empire». A key strategy to this purpose was to institute the rules for what would later be termed «global governance»—for securing its economic and geopolitical strategic intents in a world liberated from colonial rule (id est competing empires). The resulting world order, dubbed Bretton Woods I by some,4 provided an institutional framework for advancing the geopolitical strategic interests of the US in the context of a «cold war» waged against the emerging power of the USSR, and for advancing cooperation for international development, a policy designed to ensure that the economically backward countries seeking to liberate themselves from the yoke of European colonialism would not succumb to the siren of communism, that they would undertake a nation–building and development process on a capitalist path. This development project required the US to assume the lead but also share power with its major allies, strategic partners in a common enterprise organised as the OECD and a united Europe,6 with a system of United Nations institutions to provide a multilateral response to any security threats (and that prevented any one country for embarking on the path of world domination via unilateral action. This was the price that the US had to pay for national security under conditions of an emerging threat presented by the USSR—soviet communism backed up by what was feared to be a growing if not commanding state power. In this context the US began to construct its empire, and it did so on a foundation of six pillars: 1. Consolidation of the liberal capitalist world order, renovating it on neoliberal lines in the early 1980s when conditions allowed; 2. A system of military bases strategically across the world, to provide thereby the staging point and logistics for the projection of military power when needed, and rule by military force when circumstances would dictate; 3. A project of cooperation for international development, to provide financial and technical assistance to countries and regimes willing to sign on the project—to provide a safe haven for US economic interests and pave the way for the expansion of capitalism and democracy, the bulwarks of US imperialism; 4. Implementation of a neoliberal agenda of policy reforms—to adjust the macroeconomic and development policies to the requirements of a new world order in which the forces of freedom would be released from the constraints of the welfare–development state; 5. Regional integration—construction of regional free trade agreements to cooperate with, and not discriminate against, US economic interests regarding international trade; 6. Globalization—the integration of economies across the world into the global economy in a system designed to give maximum freedom to the operating units of the global empire. Each strategy not only served as a pillar of imperial policy but provided the focal point for the projection of state power in different forms as circumstances required or permitted. Together they constituted what might be termed imperialism. Each element of the system was, and is, dynamic in its operations but ultimately unstable because of the countervailing forces that they generated. Within ruling class circles in the US since at least 2000 there is an open acceptance that theirs is an imperial state and that the US should maintain or act to restore its dominant position in the 21st century by any means available, and certainly by force if need be. The whole tenor of the debate in the past two decades over US foreign policy, Mann (2007) notes, is framed in these terms. In this connection, Richard Hass, the current director of Policy Planning in e State Department, wrote an essay in November 2000 advocating that the US adopt an «imperial» feign policy. He defined this as «a foreign policy that attempts to organise the world along certain principles affecting relations between states and conditions within them». This would not be achieved through colonization or colonies but thorough what he termed «informal control» based on a «good neighbour policy» backed up by military force if and when necessary—harking back to the «informal empire» of a previous era (McLean, 1995; Roorda, 1998). Mechanisms such as international financial markets and structural reforms in macroeconomic policy, and agencies such as the World Bank, the WTO and the IMF, would work to ensure the dominance of US interests, with the military iron fist backing up the invisible hand of the market and any failure in multilateral security arrangements. This system of «economic imperialism», maintained by US hegemony as leader of the «free world» (representing the virtues of capitalist democracy), was in place and fully functioning from the 1950s throughout 1980s and the reign of Ronald Reagan. In the 1990s, with the disappearance of the threat of the Soviet Union and international communism, this system of economic imperialism, bed as it was on the hegemony of «democracy and freedom» as well multilateralism in international security arrangements, did not as much break down as it was eclipsed by the emergence of the «new imperialism» based on the unilateral projection of military force as a means of securing world domination in «the American century».7 This conception of a «new imperialism», a «raw imperialism» that would not «hesitate to use [coercive] force if, when and where necessary» (Cooper, 2000), based on «aggressive multilateralism» or the unilateral projection, and strategic use, of state power including emphatic military force, was advanced in neoconservative circles over years of largely internal debate, and put into practice by a succession of regimes, both democratic and republican. It achieved its consummate form in George W. Bush’s White House, in the Gang of Four (Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, Condoleeza Rice, Dick Cheney),8 and its maximum expression in a policy of imperial war in the Middle east and the Gulf region. Although the US also projected its military power in other theatres of imperial war such Yugoslavia9 and Colombia (viz. the covert Colombia– centered class war «on subversives» against the FARC–EP’ overt regional «war on drugs») the policy of imperial war and the strategy of military force were primarily directed towards the Gulf region (see, inter alia, Petras and Veltmeyer, 2003). In the academic world the issue as to the specific or dominant form taken by imperialism has not been generally framed as a matter of when and under what circumstances military force might be needed or legitimately used (generlly seen as a «last resort» but as the necessary part of the arsenal of force available to the state, conceived of as the only legitimate repository of the use of violence in the «national interest»). Rather, the issue of armed force in the imperialist projection of military power has been framed in terms of an understanding, or the argument. That an imperial order cannot be maintained by force and coercion; it requires «hegemony», which is to say, acquiescence by the subalterns of imperial power achieved by a widespread belief in e legitimacy of that power generated by an overarching myth or dominant ideology—the idea of freedom in the post world war II context of the «cold war» against communism and the idea of globalization in the new imperial order established in the 1980s. Power relations of domination and subordination, even when backed up by coercive or armed force, invariably give rise to resistance, and are only sustainable if and when they are legitimated by an effective ideology—ideas of «democracy» and «freedom» in the case of the American empire or «globalization» in the case of the economic imperialism that came into play in the 1990s.

#### The impact is cultural extinction.

**Escobar 95** - Distinguished Professor of Anthropology, UNC-Chapel Hill (Arturo, “Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World,” pg. 52-54)//BB

The crucial threshold and transformation that took place in the early post– World War II period discussed in this chapter were the result not of a radical epistemological or political breakthrough but of the reorganization of a number of factors that allowed the Third World to display a new visibility and to irrupt into a new realm of language. This new space was carved out of the vast and dense surface of the Third World, placing it in a field of power. Underdevelopment became the subject of political technologies that sought to erase it from the face of the Earth but that ended up, instead, multiplying it to infinity.¶ Development fostered a way of conceiving of social life as a technical problem, as a matter of rational decision and management to be entrusted to that group of people—the development professionals—whose specialized knowledge allegedly qualified them for the task. Instead of seeing change as a process rooted in the interpretation of each society's history and cultural tradition—as a number of intellectuals in various parts of the Third World had attempted to do in the 1920s and 1930s (Gandhi being the best known of them)—these professionals sought to devise mechanisms and procedures to make societies fit a preexisting model that embodied the structures and functions of modernity. Like sorcerers' apprentices, the development professionals awakened once again the dream of reason that, in their hands, as in earlier instances, produced a troubling reality.¶ At times, development grew to be so important for Third World countries that it became acceptable for their rulers to subject their populations to an infinite variety of interventions, to more encompassing forms of power and systems of control; so important that First and Third World elites accepted the price of massive impoverishment, of selling Third World resources to the most convenient bidder, of degrading their physical and human ecologies, of killing and torturing, of condemning their indigenous populations to near extinction; so important that many in the Third World began to think of themselves as inferior, underdeveloped, and ignorant and to doubt the value of their own culture, deciding instead to pledge allegiance to the banners of reason and progress; so important, finally, that the achievement of development clouded the awareness of the impossibility of fulfilling the promises that development seemed to be making.¶ After four decades of this discourse, most forms of understanding and representing the Third World are still dictated by the same basic tenets. The forms of power that have appeared act not so much by repression but by normalization; not by ignorance but by controlled knowledge; not by humanitarian concern but by the bureaucratization of social action. As the conditions that gave rise to development became more pressing, it could only increase its hold, refine its methods, and extend its reach even further. That the materiality of these conditions is not conjured up by an “objective” body of knowledge but is charted out by the rational discourses of economists, politicians, and development experts of all types should already be clear. What has been achieved is a specific configuration of factors and forces in which the new language of development finds support. As a discourse, development is thus a very real historical formation, albeit articulated around an artificial construct (underdevelopment) and upon a certain materiality (the conditions baptized as underdevelopment), which must be conceptualized in different ways if the power of the development discourse is to be challenged or displaced.¶ To be sure, there is a situation of economic exploitation that must be recognized and dealt with. Power is too cynical at the level of exploitation and should be resisted on its own terms. There is also a certain materiality of life conditions that is extremely preoccupying and that requires great effort and attention. But those seeking to understand the Third World through development have long lost sight of this materiality by building upon it a reality that like a castle in the air has haunted us for decades. Understanding the history of the investment of the Third World by Western forms of knowledge and power is a way to shift the ground somewhat so that we can start to look at that materiality with different eyes and in different categories.¶ The coherence of effects that the development discourse achieved is the key to its success as a hegemonic form of representation: the construction of the poor and underdeveloped as universal, preconstituted subjects, based on the privilege of the representers; the exercise of power over the Third World made possible by this discursive homogenization (which entails the erasure of the complexity and diversity of Third World peoples, so that a squatter in Mexico City, a Nepalese peasant, and a Tuareg nomad become equivalent to each other as poor and underdeveloped); and the colonization and domination of the natural and human ecologies and economies of the Third World. [26](http://www.questia.com/reader/action/gotoDocId/103228006)¶ Development assumes a teleology to the extent that it proposes that the “natives” will sooner or later be reformed; at the same time, however, it reproduces endlessly the separation between reformers and those to be reformed by keeping alive the premise of the Third World as different and inferior, as having a limited humanity in relation to the accomplished European. Development relies on this perpetual recognition and disavowal of difference, a feature identified by Bhabha (1990) as inherent to discrimination. The signifiers of “poverty”, “illiteracy,” “hunger,” and so forth have already achieved a fixity as signifieds of “underdevelopment” which seems impossible to sunder. Perhaps no other factor has contributed to cementing the association of “poverty” with “underdevelopment” as the discourse of economists. To them I dedicate the coming chapter.

#### The alternative is to vote negative --- rejecting imperialism in this round serves as a starting point to theorize anti-imperialism and break down hegemonic systems of knowledge.

**Morrissey 11 –** (John, Department of Geography, National University of Ireland, 2011, “Architects of Empire: The Military–Strategic Studies Complex and the Scripting of US National Security,” Antipode Vol. 43, (2):435-470, http://aran.library.nuigalway.ie/xmlui/handle/10379/2893)//a-berg

As an academic working in political geography, a key starting point of resistancefor me is the careful detailing of the largely unseen inner workings of empire in our contemporary world, ultimately in order to be better able to resist it (which is what this paper has been about). That resistance can manifest itself in counter-scriptings in a variety of contexts, from lecture halls to town halls, from academic journals to online blogs. And in a variety of public forums, many geographers have played, and continue to play, important roles in critiquing the war on terror and advancing more nuanced, reasoned and humane geographies and histories of Islam and the Middle East (Gregory 2005). Such academic and public intellectual work can also crucially liaise with, learn from, and be transformed by grassroots activists in peace and social justice movements throughout the world.44 And linking to their work in our teaching especially has more power than perhaps we sometimes realise; especially given the multimedia teaching and learning tools available today.45 A recent Antipodespecial issue saw a number of insightful reflections on the possibilities of “practising public scholarship” [volume 40(3), 2008]. The contributors outline various ways in which critical geographies can support and enable political and social activism. In addition, Don Mitchell makes an important point in reminding us thatacademic “intellectual” and “bureaucratic” work are also “vital parts of any activism” (Mitchell 2008:448). Disrupting and countering the abstracted geopolitical scriptings of strategic studies can take on a variety of forms. But both inside and outside the academy, a key intellectual task, I think, is theorizing anti-imperialism— both historically and in our contemporary moment. Effective counterdiscourses for our time must surely incorporate the lessons learned from the anti-imperial/anti-colonial struggles of history—from Ireland to India, from Algeria to Vietnam. Appellations like “insurgents” do the same discursive work today as the historical preference “rebels” did in reductively demonizing whole populations and delegitimizing their right to resistance. But more importantly, perhaps, they serve too to disengage us from unpacking the discourses and practices of contemporary anti-imperialism. Yet historical contexts of resistancehave much to offer if our endgame is articulating critical and humane geographies of our contemporary world. And this is a crucial challenge, given the sheer pervasiveness of strategic geopolitical discourses that negate human geographical realities. Such scriptings are not only intellectually unconvincing; they are dangerous and hugely consequential. In seeking to avoid dangerously reductive accounts of the world, geography for me has always had a particular responsibility and strength. In understanding conflict, past and present, discourse has perpetually played a troubled role. In reading the current proliferation of “geopolitical discourse”, it is useful to bear in mind history’smultiple reminders of the impossibilities of “colonial discourse” (Morrissey 2010). There is a need to spatialize and locate the material and corporeal geographies of war; not just its imaginative geographies. The spaces and agency of resistance or so-called “insurgency” in the war on terror, for example, are little theorized and frequently not even recognized; reflecting a power relations of knowledge familiar to any student of colonial history. This remains a key challenge for critical accounts of our contemporary geopolitical world. That said, however, connectingwhat James Sidaway calls the “banal geopolitics” of militarism to its brutal consequences will always be an urgent task too (Sidaway 2001, 2008). And the dots can be joined. The military–strategic studies complex in contemporary America is a powerful producer of banal geopolitics, patronized and prioritized geographical knowledge and ultimately actionable geostrategic intelligence. Its experts and advocates are both architects of empire and apologists for its consequences. Their dominant national security discourse is about positing legitimized, aggressive US military action against the threat of irrational terrorism emanating from the Middle East; it is about presenting the USA as the guardian of global economic health; and it is about imperial ambition too. This paper has sought to expose the military–strategic studies complex as playing a central rolein support of that imperial ambition and in the advancement of its aggressive geopolitics. I hope it has signalled too the imperative of resistance. In the face of ubiquitous scriptings of insecurity, war and geopolitics in our contemporary world, the task of both exposing the geoeconomic stakes and insisting on real places with real people, with bodies and rights just like us, is as urgent as ever.

#### Rejecting the affirmative’s production of knowledge in THIS academic space sparks a language of critique that reclaims public spaces from the militarization of knowledge --- this is NOT about offense and defense or weighing the case --- this is a pass/fail gateway issue. If the 1AC has produced bad scholarship, you vote negative to send them home to write a better 1AC.

**Giroux 12** (Henry, Global TV Network Chair in English and Cultural Studies at [McMaster University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/McMaster_University) in [Hamilton, Ontario](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hamilton%2C_Ontario), “Against the Militarized Academy”, 7.4.12,<http://nnomy.org/index.php?option=com_flexicontent&view=items&cid=290%3Amilitarism-a-war&id=545%3Aagainst-the-militarized-academy&Itemid=821&lang=en>, [CL])

While there is an ongoing discussion about what shape the military-industrial complex will take under an Obama presidency, what is often left out of this analysis is the intrusion of the military into higher education. One example of the increasingly intensified and expansive symbiosis between the military-industrial complex and academia was on full display when Robert Gates, the secretary of defense, announced the creation of what he calls a new "Minerva Consortium," ironically named after the goddess of wisdom, whose purpose is to fund various universities to "carry out social-sciences research relevant to national security."([1](http://archive.truthout.org/112008J#1)) Gates's desire to turn universities into militarized knowledge factories producing knowledge, research and personnel in the interest of the Homeland (In)Security State should be of special concern for intellectuals, artists, academics and others who believe that the university should oppose such interests and alignments. At the very least, the emergence of the Minerva Consortium raises a larger set of concerns about the ongoing militarization of higher education in the United States. In a post-9/11 world, with its all-embracing war on terror and a culture of fear, the increasing spread of the discourse and values of militarization throughout the social order is intensifying the shift from the promise of a liberal democracy to the reality of a militarized society. Militarization suggests more than simply a militaristic ideal - with its celebration of war as the truest measure of the health of the nation and the soldier-warrior as the most noble expression of the merging of masculinity and unquestioning patriotism - but an intensification and expansion of the underlying values, practices, ideologies, social relations and cultural representations associated with military culture. What appears new about the amplified militarization of the post-9/11 world is that it has become normalized, serving as a powerful educational force that shapes our lives, memories and daily experiences. As an educational force, military power produces identities, goods, institutions, knowledge, modes of communication and affective investments - in short, it now bears down on all aspects of social life and the social order. As Michael Geyer points out, what is distinctive about the militarization of the social order is that civil society not only "organizes itself for the production of violence,"([2](http://archive.truthout.org/112008J#2)) but increasingly spurs a gradual erosion of civil liberties. Military power and policies are expanded to address not only matters of defense and security, but also problems associated with the entire health and social life of the nation, which are now measured by military spending, discipline and loyalty, as well as hierarchical modes of authority. As citizens increasingly assume the roles of informer, soldier and consumer willing to enlist in or be conscripted by the totalizing war on terror, we see the very idea of the university as a site of critical thinking, public service and socially responsible research being usurped by a manic jingoism and a market-driven fundamentalism that enshrine the entrepreneurial spirit and military aggression as means to dominate and control society. This should not surprise us, since, as William G. Martin, a professor of sociology at Binghamton University, indicates, "universities, colleges and schools have been targeted precisely because they are charged with both socializing youth and producing knowledge of peoples and cultures beyond the borders of Anglo-America."([3](http://archive.truthout.org/112008J#3)) But rather than be lulled into complacency by the insidious spread of corporate and military power, we need to be prepared to reclaim institutions such as the university that have historically served as vital democratic spheresprotecting and serving the interests of social justice and equality. What I want to suggest is that such a struggle is not only political, but also pedagogical in nature. Over 17 million students pass through the hallowed halls of academe, and it is crucial that they be educated in ways that enable them to recognize creeping militarization and its effects throughout American society, particularly in terms of how these effects threaten "democratic government at home just as they menace the independence and sovereignty of other countries."([4](http://archive.truthout.org/112008J#4)) But students must also recognize how such anti-democratic forces work in attempting to dismantle the university itself as a place to learn how to think critically and participate in public debate and civic engagement.([5](http://archive.truthout.org/112008J#5)) In part, this means giving them the tools to fight for the demilitarization of knowledge on college campuses - to resist complicity with the production of knowledge, information and technologies in classrooms and research labs that contribute to militarized goals and violence. Even so, there is more at stake than simply educating students to be alert to the dangers of militarization and the way in which it is redefining the very mission of higher education. Chalmers Johnson, in his continuing critique of the threat that the politics of empire presents to democracy at home and abroad, argues that if the United States is not to degenerate into a military dictatorship, in spite of Obama's election, a grass-roots movement will have to occupy center stage in opposing militarization, government secrecy and imperial power, while reclaiming the basic principles of democracy.([6](http://archive.truthout.org/112008J#6)) Such a task may seem daunting, but there is a crucial need for faculty, students, administrators and concerned citizens to develop alliances for long-term organizations and social movements to resist the growing ties among higher education, on the one hand, and the armed forces, intelligence agencies and war industries on the other - ties that play a crucial role in reproducing militarized knowledge. Opposing militarization as part of a broader pedagogical strategy in and out of the classroom also raises the question of what kinds of competencies, skills and knowledge might be crucial to such a task. One possibility is to develop critical educational theories and practices that define the space of learning not only through the critical consumption of knowledge but also through its production for peaceful and socially just ends. In the fight against militarization and "armed intellectuals," educators need a language of critique, but they also need a language that embraces a sense of hope and collective struggle.This means elaborating the meaning of politics through a concerted effort to expand the space of politics by reclaiming "the public character of spaces, relations, and institutions regarded as private" on the other.([7](http://archive.truthout.org/112008J#7)) We live at a time when matters of life and death are central to political governance.While registering the shift in power toward the large-scale production of death, disposability and exclusion, a new understanding of the meaning and purpose of higher education must also point to notions of agency, power and responsibility that operate in the service of life, democratic struggles and the expansion of human rights. Finally, if higher education is to come to grips with the multilayered pathologies produced by militarization, it will have to rethink not merely the space of the university as a democratic public sphere, but also the global space in which intellectuals, educators, students, artists, labor unions and other social actors and movements can form transnational alliances to oppose the death-dealing ideology of militarization and its effects on the world - including violence, pollution, massive poverty, racism, the arms trade, growth of privatized armies, civil conflict, child slavery and the ongoing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. As the Bush regime comes to an end, it is time for educators and students to take a stand and develop global organizations that can be mobilized in the effort to supplant a culture of war with a culture of peace, whose elemental principles must be grounded in relations of economic, political, cultural and social democracy and the desire to sustain human life.

### T

#### Interpretation and violation --- economic engagement requires trade promotion --- the plan is an economic inducement

**Celik, 11** – master’s student at Uppsala University (Department of Peace and Conflict Research) (Arda, Economic Sanctions and Engagement Policies <http://www.grin.com/en/e-book/175204/economic-sanctions-and-engagement-policies>)

Literature of liberal school points out that economic engagement policies are significantly effective tools for sender and target countries. The effectiveness leans on mutual economic and political benefits for both parties.(Garzke et al,2001).Ecenomic engagement operates with trade mechanisms where sender and target country establish intensified trade thus increase the economic interaction over time. This strategy decreases the potential hostilities and provides mutual gains. Paulson Jr (2008) states that this mechanism is highly different from carrots (inducements). Carrots work quid pro quo in short terms and for narrow goals. Economic engagement intends to develop the target country and wants her to be aware of the long term benefits of shared economic goals. Sender does not want to contain nor prevent the target country with different policies. Conversely; sender works deliberately to improve the target countries’ Gdp, trade potential, export-import ratios and national income. Sender acts in purpose to reach important goals. First it establishes strong economic ties because economic integration has the capacity to change the political choices and behaviour of target country. Sender state believes in that economic linkages have political transformation potential.(Kroll,1993)

#### C. Voting issue –

#### 1. limits – broad interpretations of engagement include anything that effects the economy, which means everything

#### 2. negative ground – trade promotion is vital for a stable mechanism for disad links and counterplan ground

### CP

#### Text: Congress should delegate the authority to substantially increase its long term nanotechnology economic engagement toward Mexico to the Department of Commerce. The Department of Commerce should pursue and enact the congressional delegation.

#### The United States federal government should

#### CP is competitive – they don’t spec their agent which is a reason to vote neg for *Process Education* – crowds out discussion of specific policy process – and *Ground* – they spike agent DA’s and CP’s. They can’t solve because USFG isn’t actor.

#### Solves and net benefit is ptx.

**Epstein et Al., 99** (David Epstein- Department of Political Science and Stanford Graduate School of Business, Columbia and Stanford University, and Sharyn O’Hallaron- Department of Political Science and the School of International and Public Affairs and Hoover Institution, Columbia and Stanford University, January 1999 (“The Nondelegation Doctrine and the Separation of Powers” – Cardozo Law Review) p. lexis

Our institutional analysis begins with the observation that there are two alternative modes for specifying the details of public policy. Policy can be made through the typical legislative process, in which a committee considers a bill and reports it to the floor of the chamber, and then a majority of the floor members must agree on a policy to enact. Alternatively, Congress can pass a law that delegates authority to regulatory agencies, allowing them to fill in some or all of the details of policy. The key is that, given a fixed amount of policy details to be specified, these two modes of poli [\*962] cymaking are substitutes for each other. To the degree that one is used more, the other will perforce be used less. Note also that it is Congress who chooses where policy is made. Legislators can either write detailed, exacting laws, in which case the executive branch will have little or no substantive input into policy, they can delegate the details to agencies, thereby giving the executive branch a substantial role in the policymaking process, or they can pick any point in between. Since legislators' primary goal is reelection, it follows that policy will be made so as to maximize legislators' reelection chances. Thus, delegation will follow the natural fault lines of legislators' political advantage. In making this institutional choice, legislators face costs either way. Making explicit laws requires legislative time and energy that might be profitably spent on more electorally productive activities. After all, one of the reasons bureaucracies are created is for agencies to implement policies in areas where Congress has neither the time nor expertise to micro-manage policy decisions, and by restricting flexibility, Congress would be limiting agencies' ability to adjust to changing circumstances. This tradeoff is captured well by Terry Moe in his discussion of regulatory structure: The most direct way [to control agencies] is for today's authorities to specify, in excruciating detail, precisely what the agency is to do and how it is to do it, leaving as little as possible to the discretionary judgment of bureaucrats - and thus as little as possible for future authorities to exercise control over, short of passing new legislation... Obviously, this is not a formula for creating effective organizations. In the interests of public protection, agencies are knowingly burdened with cumbersome, complicated, technically inappropriate structures that undermine their capacity to perform their jobs well. n40 Where oversight and monitoring problems do not exist, legislators would readily delegate authority to the executive branch, taking advantage of agency expertise, conserving scarce resources of time, staff, and energy, and avoiding the logrolls, delays, and informational inefficiencies associated with the committee system. Consider, for example, the issue of airline safety, which is characterized on the one hand by the need for technical expertise, and on the other hand by an almost complete absence of potential political benefits. That is, policymakers will receive little credit if airlines run well and no disasters occur, but they will have to with [\*963] stand intense scrutiny if something goes wrong. n41 Furthermore, legislative and executive preferences on this issue would tend to be almost perfectly aligned - have fewer accidents as long as the costs to airlines are not prohibitive. The set of individuals receiving benefits, the public who use the airlines, is diffused and ill organized, while those paying the costs of regulation, the airline companies, are well-organized and politically active. Furthermore, keeping in mind that deficiencies in the system are easily detectable, delegated power is relatively simple to monitor. For all these reasons, even if legislators had unlimited time and resources of their own (which they do not), delegation to the executive branch would be the preferred mode of policymaking.

### Competitiveness

#### Economic leadership’s resilient and inevitable

Eric S. **Edelman 10**, former Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, was Principal Deputy Assistant to the Vice President for National Security Affairs, 2010, “Understanding America’s Contested Primacy,” Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments

Morgenthau talks about national morale and character as key elements of national power; characteristics that don’t normally weigh heavily in declinist literature which favors the easily quantifiable measures such as national shares of global economic product. As Robert Lieber has recently argued, US resilience, which results from the openness of American society and its resulting flexibility and adaptability, will benefit the United States as it responds to the Great Recession and the prospect of national decline. In that regard the often-criticized American “capitalisme sauvage,” which many foreign critics blame for producing the economic crisis, may assist the United States in recovering more quickly than others. As a recent Economist survey of business in America noted, the Schumpeterian process of “creative destruction” means that “America’s non-financial businesses are suffering. But they will emerge from the recession leaner and stronger than ever.” Niall Ferguson predicts that “when the crisis ends, America will still be the best place in the world to do business.” That is fully consistent with the findings of the recently released third annual Legatum Institute Prosperity Index which rated the United States number one in the world for innovation and entrepreneurship and found that “the ability of a nation’s people to innovate is more strongly related to the soundness of its economy than any other factor.”129

Openness to innovation may also play an important role in extending the United States’ leading role in the international economy. Some scholars believe that innovation is the key to countries emerging as system leaders in sectors that power long waves of economic activity and growth. Failure to maintain system leadership in these sectors is a key cause of decline. Twenty years ago William R. Thompson observed “a key, if not the key to the relative economic decline of the United States will be what happens in the next upturn of the leading sector long wave. This assumes that there will be an upturn and that the long wave dynamic will continue into the twenty-first century when biotechnology, computers, robotics, lasers, and new sources of energy may well lay the leading sector foundation for the upswing.” US leadership and facility with information technology has been one of the drivers of US increased productivity in the past twenty years. A study by the London School of Economics has demonstrated that, as its title declares, “Americans do I.T. better.” US-owned UK subsidiaries, for example, use information technology better than non-US owned UK firms because they are organized to use IT more efficiently. This offers yet another strategic advantage vis-à-vis China, which seems to have great difficulty with both innovation and managing the social and collaborative uses of information technology.130

#### Alt cause --- debt crisis.

**Goff 12** [Emily, Research Associate at The Heritage Foundation, “U.S. Falls in World Economic Competitiveness Rankings,” <http://blog.heritage.org/2012/09/07/u-s-falls-in-world-economic-competitiveness-rankings/>]

The United States’ competitive edge in the global economy is not what it used to be. The World Economic Forum (WEF) reported that the U.S. dropped from fifth to seventh place—the fourth consecutive year it has fallen in the rankings. Chief among the reasons is the one-two punch of skyrocketing **debt** and uncertainty among businesses that Washington will address the country’s fiscal and economic problems. Gee, that sounds familiar. National debt recently cruised past the $16 trillion mark and is continuing its ascent toward the current debt limit of $16.394 trillion. It has already eclipsed the size of the entire U.S. economy. Reaching the debt limit again will serve as a grave reminder that Washington’s spending spree and failure to reform entitlement programs that are driving spending is wreaking havoc on the budget. That not only threatens to saddle future generations with crushing levels of debt—and taxes to pay for it—but also compromises the health of the U.S. economy right now. Such irresponsibility in Washington—manifest in over-spending, huge and chronic budget deficits, and massive debt—diminishes the business community’s trust that the government can and will get the country’s fiscal house in order. Whether it is a failure to stave off Taxmageddon’s tax hikes now, rein in federal spending, or reprioritize the sequestration’s automatic spending cuts scheduled to deliver a serious blow to our national defense, Washington is only generatingthe bad kind ofuncertainty—and lots of it. Because there is such distrust of political leaders and institutions, and government is grossly misusing its resources, businesses, investors, and families feel their hands are tied. Tepid economic growth results—a point we see reinforced by the latest in a slew of mediocre jobs reports. The Heritage Foundation’s own Index of Economic Freedom tells a similar story: The U.S. dropped to tenth place in 2012 and has been relegated from a “free” status to “mostly free.” As the Index authors write: Restoring the U.S. economy to the status of a “free” economy will require significant policy changes to reduce the size of government, overhaul the tax system, and transform costly entitlement programs. While certain measures of competitiveness in the U.S. remain strong, the overall trend is headed in the wrong direction. If for some reason Congress and the President needed additional urging to address these “escalating and unaddressed weaknesses,” as the WEF report calls them, this year’s report should do just that.

#### The economy is resilient

Zakaria, ‘9 - Fareed (editor of Newsweek International) December 2009 “The Secrets of Stability,” <http://www.newsweek.com/id/226425/page/2>]

**One year ago, the world seemed as if it might be coming apart. The global financial system,** which had fueled a great expansion of capitalism and trade across the world, **was crumbling**. All the certainties of the age of globalization—about the virtues of free markets, trade, and technology—were being called into question. Faith in the American model had collapsed. The financial industry had crumbled. Once-roaring emerging markets like China, India, and Brazil were sinking. Worldwide trade was shrinking to a degree not seen since the 1930s. Pundits whose bearishness had been vindicated predict**ed** we were doomed to a long, painful bust, with cascading failures in sector after sector, country after country**.** In a widely cited essay that appeared in The Atlantic **n** this May, Simon Johnson, former chief economist of the International Monetary Fund, wrote: "The conventional wisdom among the elite is still that the current slump 'cannot be as bad as the Great Depression.' This view is wrong. What we face now could, in fact, be worse than the Great Depression**."** Others predicted **that these** economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries. At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets. Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization. **One year later, how much has the world really changed**? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran. Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. But **overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s.** The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all**.** A key measure of fear and fragility is the ability of poor and unstable countries to borrow money on the debt markets. So consider this: the sovereign bonds of tottering Pakistan have returned 168 percent so far this year. All this doesn't add up to a recovery yet, but it does reflect a return to some level of normalcy. And that rebound has been so rapid that even the shrewdest observers remain puzzled. "The question I have at the back of my head is 'Is that it?' " says Charles Kaye, the co-head of Warburg Pincus. "We had this huge crisis, and now we're back to business as usual?"This revival did not happen because markets **managed to** stabilize themselves **on their own.** Rather, governments, having learned the lessons of the Great Depression, were determined not to repeat the same mistakes once this crisis hit. By massively expanding state support for the economy—through central banks and national treasuries—they buffered the worst of the damage. (Whether they made new mistakes in the process remains to be seen.) The extensive social safety nets that have been established across the industrialized world also cushioned the pain felt by many. Times are still tough, but things are nowhere near as bad as in the 1930s, when governments played a tiny role in national economies. It's true that the massive state interventions of the past year may be fueling some new bubbles: the cheap cash and government guarantees provided to banks, companies, and consumers have fueled some irrational exuberance in stock and bond markets. Yet these rallies also demonstrate the return of confidence, and confidence is a very powerful economic force. When John Maynard Keynes described his own prescriptions for economic growth, he believed government action could provide only a temporary fix until the real motor of the economy started cranking again—the animal spirits of investors, consumers, and companies seeking risk and profit. Beyond all this, though, I believe **there's a fundamental reason why we have not faced global collapse** in the last year. **It is the same reason that** we weathered the stock-market crash of 1987, the recession of 1992, the Asian crisis of 1997, the Russian default of 1998, and the tech-bubble collapse of 2000. The **current** global economic system is inherently more resilient than we think**. The world today is characterized by** three **major forces for stability**, each reinforcing the other and each historical in nature.

#### Decline doesn’t cause conflict.

Gelb 10 - Leslie H., President Emeritus of the Council on Foreign Relations; was a senior official in the U.S. Defense Department from 1967 to 1969 and in the State Department from 1977 to 1979, November/December 2010, “GDP Now Matters More Than Force,” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 89, No. 6

To an unprecedented degree, the major powers now need one another to grow their economies, and they are loath to jeopardize this interdependence by allowing traditional military and strategic competitions to escalate into wars. In the past, U.S. enemies--such as the Soviet Union--would have rejoiced at the United States' losing a war in Afghanistan. Today, the United States and its enemies share an interest in blocking the spread of both Taliban extremism and the Afghan-based drug trade. China also looks to U.S. arms to protect its investments in Afghanistan, such as large natural-resource mines. More broadly, no great nation is challenging the balance of power in either Europe or Asia. Although nations may not help one another, they rarely oppose one another in explosive situations. Given the receding threat of great-power war, leaders around the world can afford to elevate economic priorities as never before. To be sure, leaders throughout history have pursued economic strength as the foundation of state power, but power itself was equated with military might. Today, the prevailing idea is that economic strength should be applied primarily toward achieving economic--not military--ends. Money is what counts most, so most nations limit their spending on standing armies and avoid military interventions. What preoccupies most leaders is trade, investment, access to markets, exchange rates, additional riches for the rich, and a better life for the rest. This trend is plain among the rising regional powers known as the BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, India, and China) and among such others as Indonesia, Mexico, South Africa, and Turkey. Although these countries' leaders have major security concerns--such as India with regard to Pakistan--their paramount objective has become economic strength. For most, economic growth is their prime means of fending off internal political opposition. China makes perhaps the best case for the primacy of economics. Although it might emerge as a spoiler decades hence, Beijing currently promotes the existing economic order and does not threaten war. Because Beijing has been playing the new economic game at a maestro level--staying out of wars and political confrontations and zeroing in on business--its global influence far exceeds its existing economic strength. China gains extra power from others' expectations of its future growth. The country has become a global economic giant without becoming a global military power. Nations do not fear China's military might; they fear its ability to give or withhold trade and investments.

#### No impact to heg.

**Fettweis 11** Christopher J. Fettweis, Department of Political Science, Tulane University, 9/26/11, Free Riding or Restraint? Examining European Grand Strategy, Comparative Strategy, 30:316–332, EBSCO

It is perhaps worth noting that there is no evidence to support a direct relationship between the relative level of U.S. activism and international stability. In fact, the limited data we do have suggest the opposite may be true. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on its defense spending fairly substantially. By 1998, the United States was spending $100 billion less on defense in real terms than it had in 1990.51 To internationalists, defense hawks and believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible “peace dividend” endangered both national and global security. “No serious analyst of American military capabilities,” argued Kristol and Kagan, “doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America’s responsibilities to itself and to world peace.”52 On the other hand, if the pacific trends were not based upon U.S. hegemony but a strengthening norm against interstate war, one would not have expected an increase in global instability and violence. The verdict from the past two decades is fairly plain: The world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable United States military, or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief. No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums, no security dilemmas drove insecurity or arms races, and no regional balancing occurred once the stabilizing presence of the U.S. military was diminished. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international war was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in U.S. capabilities. Most of all, the United States and its allies were no less safe. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the United States cut its military spending under President Clinton, and kept declining as the Bush Administration ramped the spending back up. No complex statistical analysis should be necessary to reach the conclusion that the two are unrelated. Military spending figures by themselves are insufficient to disprove a connection between overall U.S. actions and international stability. Once again, one could presumably argue that spending is not the only or even the best indication of hegemony, and that it is instead U.S. foreign political and security commitments that maintain stability. Since neither was significantly altered during this period, instability should not have been expected. Alternately, advocates of hegemonic stability could believe that relative rather than absolute spending is decisive in bringing peace. Although the United States cut back on its spending during the 1990s, its relative advantage never wavered. However, even if it is true that either U.S. commitments or relative spending account for global pacific trends, then at the very least stability can evidently be maintained at drastically lower levels of both. In other words, even if one can be allowed to argue in the alternative for a moment and suppose that there is in fact a level of engagement below which the United States cannot drop without increasing international disorder, a rational grand strategist would still recommend cutting back on engagement and spending until that level is determined. Grand strategic decisions are never final; continual adjustments can and must be made as time goes on. Basic logic suggests that the United States ought to spend the minimum amount of its blood and treasure while seeking the maximum return on its investment. And if the current era of stability is as stable as many believe it to be, no increase in conflict would ever occur irrespective of U.S. spending, which would save untold trillions for an increasingly debt-ridden nation. It is also perhaps worth noting that if opposite trends had unfolded, if other states had reacted to news of cuts in U.S. defense spending with more aggressive or insecure behavior, then internationalists would surely argue that their expectations had been fulfilled. If increases in conflict would have been interpreted as proof of the wisdom of internationalist strategies, then logical consistency demands that the lack thereof should at least pose a problem. As it stands, the only evidence we have regarding the likely systemic reaction to a more restrained United States suggests that the current peaceful trends are unrelated to U.S. military spending. Evidently the rest of the world can operate quite effectively without the presence of a global policeman. Those who think otherwise base their view on faith alone.

#### No impact to the transition

**Ikenberry ‘8** professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University (John, The Rise of China and the Future of the West Can the Liberal System Survive?, Foreign Affairs, Jan/Feb)

Some observers believe that the American era is coming to an end, as the Western-oriented world order is replaced by one increasingly dominated by the East. The historian Niall Ferguson has written that the bloody twentieth century witnessed "the descent of the West" and "a reorientation of the world" toward the East. Realists go on to note that as China gets more powerful and the United States' position erodes, two things are likely to happen: China will try to use its growing influence to reshape the rules and institutions of the international system to better serve its interests, and other states in the system -- especially the declining hegemon -- will start to see China as a growing security threat. The result of these developments, they predict, will be tension, distrust, and conflict, the typical features of a power transition. In this view, the drama of China's rise will feature an increasingly powerful China and a declining United States locked in an epic battle over the rules and leadership of the international system. And as the world's largest country emerges not from within but outside the established post-World War II international order, it is a drama that will end with the grand ascendance of China and the onset of an Asian-centered world order. That course, however, is not inevitable. The rise of China does not have to trigger a wrenching hegemonic transition. The U.S.-Chinese power transition can be very different from those of the past because China faces an international order that is fundamentally different from those that past rising states confronted. China does not just face the United States; it faces a Western-centered system that is open, integrated, and rule-based, with wide and deep political foundations. The nuclear revolution, meanwhile, has made war among great powers unlikely -- eliminating the major tool that rising powers have used to overturn international systems defended by declining hegemonic states. Today's Western order, in short, is hard to overturn and easy to join. This unusually durable and expansive order is itself the product of farsighted U.S. leadership. After World War II, the United States did not simply establish itself as the leading world power. It led in the creation of universal institutions that not only invited global membership but also brought democracies and market societies closer together. It built an order that facilitated the participation and integration of both established great powers and newly independent states. (It is often forgotten that this postwar order was designed in large part to reintegrate the defeated Axis states and the beleaguered Allied states into a unified international system.) Today, China can gain full access to and thrive within this system. And if it does, China will rise, but the Western order -- if managed properly -- will live on.

#### Hegemony inevitable- power is relative

**Bremmer and Gordon 12/27** (Ian Bremmer is president of Eurasia Group and author of “The End of the Free Market: Who Wins the War Between States and Corporations?” David F. Gordon, former director of policy planning at the State Department, is head of research at Eurasia Group, “An Upbeat View of America's 'Bad' Year”, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/28/opinion/an-upbeat-view-of-americas-bad-year.html?pagewanted=all>, December 27, 2011,

Among global big thinkers, never a bashful crowd, the notion of a United States in decline has become conventional wisdom. In late 2011, this narrative has crescendoed, with experts arguing that China has surpassed the United States economically, Niall Ferguson declaring that we are at “the end of 500 years of Western predominance” and The National Interest proclaiming “the end of the American era.” Even the National Intelligence Council’s coming Global Trends 2030 study reportedly assumes an America in decline. As 2011 draws to a close, the U.S. military’s exit from Iraq and challenges in Afghanistan along with American vulnerability to the European crisis provide further confirmation of the decline narrative. We agree with some of these views. The United States has neither the willingness nor the capability to provide the kind of global leadership that it has provided in the past several decades, and other countries are increasingly less willing to follow America’s lead. But the conventional wisdom obscures as much as it reveals. Specifically, the declinists overlook the inconvenient truth that global power is relative. And comparing America’s year to that of our present and potential adversaries paints an interesting picture: 2011 was not the year when the United States fell off the wagon. Instead, a look back at the past 12 months suggests that U.S. power is more resilient than the narrative of inevitable decline portrays. Take Al Qaeda, our most consistent adversary (by their definition and ours) since the 9/11 attacks. Despite some severe missteps, we have in 10 years degraded Al Qaeda’s capabilities to the point that they are having difficulty mounting attacks against significant targets. In 2011, the United States killed Al Qaeda’s most effective propagandist, Anwar al-Awlaki; its operating chief, Atiyah Abd al-Rahman; and of course its founder, chief executive and spiritual leader, Osama bin Laden. Moreover, the Arab Spring undercut the notion that political change in the Middle East requires the violent jihad that Bin Laden spent his career espousing. The fight against extremist Islam is an impossible one in which to declare success. Yet the fact remains that while Al Qaeda began the War on Terror with a horrific assault on the foremost symbols of U.S. economic and military power, it leaves 2011 effectively leaderless, rudderless and reduced to boasting about kidnapping defenseless U.S. aid workers. Iran’s leaders also exit 2011 in worse shape than they entered it. Early in the year, they viewed the demise of Middle Eastern potentates as accelerating their rise to regional dominance. Turkish anger over the Mavi Marmara incident continued to draw Ankara closer to Tehran. Saudi anger at the perceived lack of U.S. support for Egypt’s Hosni Mubarak seemed to threaten a permanent rupture in the U.S. relationship with a key ally, and Iran assumed that it would be the beneficiary of declining American influence in the Arab World. But the Arab Spring has unfolded very differently. Iran’s closest, most vital, and in some ways only Arab ally, Syria’s Bashar al-Assad, ends the year leading an embattled, isolated regime facing a combination of civil war and economic sanctions that his government is unlikely to survive. Iran’s relationship with Turkey has deteriorated sharply, and, along with Saudi Arabia, Ankara has in fact drawn closer to the United States. Indeed, the nascent U.S.-Turkey-Saudi troika is one of the most important but least noticed trends of the past few months. Combined with another year without nuclear weapons — the program apparently thwarted significantly by covert operations — and a tightening vise of economic sanctions, these events have left Iran’s leaders disoriented. After years of growing consensus, Iran’s elites are now increasingly fragmented and at one another’s throats. Moreover, Tehran spent the past few months engaged in a stunning series of blunders: plotting with Mexican drug dealers to assassinate the Saudi ambassador to the United States and allowing regime supporters to storm the British Embassy in Tehran, the combination of which has re-energized global efforts to squeeze Iran financially. The assumption that Iran is the emerging regional power has shattered. China, which most of the declinists identify as America’s greatest future rival, has likewise had a difficult 2011. With U.S. willingness to lead receding, the international spotlight has fallen on Beijing. And on every issue — the euro zone crisis, climate change and rebalancing the global economy — China has declined to take the lead, to criticism and dismay at home and abroad. Beijing has failed to reconcile rising domestic nationalism with assuaging its neighbors’ increasing alarm over Chinese economic sustainability and strategic hegemony. China’s miscalculations in Northeast and Southeast Asia have allowed the United States to reassert traditional alliances in the region (with Japan and South Korea), establish new beachheads (placing a permanent U.S. Marine Corps presence in Australia), and create a process and institutions (the Trans-Pacific Partnership) for a balanced Asia–Pacific regional architecture, rather than one dominated by the Middle Kingdom. Compared to this, 2011 has not been a bad year for America. It is a stretch to call the Iraq war a victory, but the endgame in the Afghan quagmire is slowly coming into focus. And for all our fiscal problems, global funding has to flow somewhere, and our capital markets are still unparalleled. China won’t internationalize the renminbi, the euro is fragile and gold is not a country. As a result, the dollar remains the world’s reserve currency, and U.S. Treasury bills the global financial safe haven. This will inevitably change in the long term, but not for quite some time. The unipolar moment is over. But for 2011 at least, the world order has remained the United States and the rest.

### Environment

#### **Their internal link to the environment is tiny --- cross ex proves**

#### Squo solves – U.S. and Mexico are cooperating on regulations now

**HLRCC 12** (High-Level Regulatory Cooperation Council, Executive Office of the President of the United States, “UNITED STATES-MEXICO HIGH-LEVEL REGULATORY COOPERATION COUNCIL WORK PLAN,” 02/28/2012, http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/oira/irc/united-states-mexico-high-level-regulatory-cooperation-council-work-plan.pdf, AC)

The fourth item on the HLRCC Work Plan involves the potential alignment of U.S. and ¶ Mexican policy approaches to oversight of applications of nanotechnology and nanomaterials. ¶ The relevant agencies are the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) and the ¶ National Metrology Centre (CENAM).¶ Description: Mexico and the United States are in the process of developing principles and ¶ approaches to inform government oversight and regulation of nanotechnology applications and ¶ nanomaterials.¶ Objective/Desired Outcome: Share information and develop approaches on foundational ¶ regulatory elements, including terminology/nomenclature, information-gathering, and ¶ approaches to risk assessment and management. Develop initiatives to align regulatory ¶ approaches in specific areas, such that consistency exists for consumers and industry in Mexico ¶ and the United States.¶ 8¶ INEGI, National Accounts, January to August 2011. UNITED STATES-MEXICO High-Level Regulatory Cooperation Council WORK Plan¶ 9¶ Specific Deliverables and Timeline: Specific deliverables identified in the Work Plan include: ¶  The United States will share with Mexico the list of regulators that were involved in ¶ the development of the general nanotechnology principles (accomplished by ¶ September 2011);¶  Response of Mexico’s relevant regulators to the U.S. Memorandum on “Policy ¶ Principles for the U.S. Decision-making Concerning Regulation and Oversight of ¶ Applications of Nanotechnology and Nanomaterials,” of June 9, 2011 (accomplished ¶ by October 2011);¶  Creation of a mechanism for exchanging information between the United States and ¶ Mexico on regulatory matters for nanotechnology applications and nanomaterials ¶ (accomplished by February 2012);¶  Share the advances of the Mexican side on potential principles on regulations for ¶ nanotechnology applications and nanomaterials (accomplished by February 2012);¶ and ¶  Engage in a dialogue to consider a possible model framework providing key elements ¶ and approaches to regulating nanotechnology applications and nanomaterials with ¶ respect to potential impacts on the environment, human health, labor, food or ¶ agriculture (by February 2013).¶

#### No impact to biodiversity

Sagoff 97  Mark, Senior Research Scholar – Institute for Philosophy and Public policy in School of Public Affairs – U. Maryland, William and Mary Law Review, “INSTITUTE OF BILL OF RIGHTS LAW SYMPOSIUM DEFINING TAKINGS: PRIVATE PROPERTY AND THE FUTURE OF GOVERNMENT REGULATION: MUDDLE OR MUDDLE THROUGH? TAKINGS JURISPRUDENCE MEETS THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT”, 38 Wm and Mary L. Rev. 825, March, L/N

Note – Colin Tudge - Research Fellow at the Centre for Philosophy at the London School of Economics. Frmr Zoological Society of London: Scientific Fellow and tons of other positions. PhD. Read zoology at Cambridge.

Simon Levin = Moffet Professor of Biology, Princeton. 2007 American Institute of Biological Sciences Distinguished Scientist Award 2008 Istituto Veneto di Scienze Lettere ed Arti 2009 Honorary Doctorate of Science, Michigan State University 2010 Eminent Ecologist Award, Ecological Society of America 2010 Margalef Prize in Ecology, etc… PhD

Although one may agree with ecologists such as Ehrlich and Raven that the earth stands on **the brink of** an episode of **massive extinction, it may not follow** from this grim fact **that human** being**s will suffer** as a result. On the contrary, skeptics such as science writer Colin Tudge have challenged biologists to explain **why we need more than a tenth of the 10 to 100 million species that grace the earth**. Noting that "cultivated systems often out-produce wild systems by 100-fold or more," Tudge declared that "the argument that humans need the variety of other species is, when you think about it, a theological one." n343 Tudge observed that "the elimination of all but a tiny minority **of our fellow creatures does not affect the material well-being of humans** one iota."n344 This skeptic challenged ecologists to list more than 10,000 species (other than unthreatened microbes) that are essential to ecosystem productivity or functioning. n345 "**The human species could survive just as well** if 99.9% of our fellow creatures went extinct, provided only that we retained the appropriate 0.1% that we need." n346   [\*906]   The monumental Global Biodiversity Assessment ("the Assessment") identified two positions with respect to redundancy of species. "At one extreme is the idea that each species is unique and important, such that its removal or loss will have demonstrable consequences to the functioning of the community or ecosystem." n347 The authors of the Assessment, a panel of eminent ecologists, endorsed this position, saying it is "unlikely that there is much, if any, ecological redundancy in communities over time scales of decades to centuries, the time period over which environmental policy should operate." n348 These eminent ecologists rejected the opposing view, "the notion that species overlap in function to a sufficient degree that removal or loss of a species will be compensated by others, with negligible overall consequences to the community or ecosystem." n349  Other biologists believe, however, that species are so fabulously redundant in the ecological functions they perform that the life-support systems and processes of the planet and ecological processes in general will function perfectly well with fewer of them, certainly fewer than the millions and millions we can expect to remain **even if** **every threatened organism becomes extinct**. n350 Even the kind of sparse and miserable world depicted in the movie Blade Runner could provide a "sustainable" context for the human economy as long as people forgot their aesthetic and moral commitment to the glory and beauty of the natural world. n351 The Assessment makes this point. "Although any ecosystem contains hundreds to thousands of species interacting among themselves and their physical environment, the emerging consensus is that the system is driven by a small number of . . . biotic variables on whose interactions the balance of species are, in a sense, carried along." n352   [\*907]   To make up your mind on the question of the functional redundancy of species, consider an endangered species of bird, plant, or insect and ask how the ecosystem would fare in its absence. The fact that the creature is endangered suggests an answer: it is already in limbo as far as ecosystem processes are concerned. What crucial ecological services does the black-capped vireo, for example, serve? Are any of the species threatened with extinction necessary to the provision of any ecosystem service on which humans depend? If so, which ones are they?  Ecosystems and the species that compose them have changed, dramatically, continually, and totally in virtually every part of the United States. There is little ecological similarity, for example, between New England today and the land where the Pilgrims died. n353 In view of the constant reconfiguration of the biota, **one may wonder why Americans have not suffered more as a result of ecological catastrophes**. The cast of species in nearly every environment changes constantly-local extinction is commonplace in nature-but the crops still grow. Somehow, it seems, property values keep going up on Martha's Vineyard in spite of the tragic disappearance of the heath hen.  One might argue that the sheer number and variety of creatures available to any ecosystem buffers that system against stress. Accordingly, we should be concerned if the "library" of creatures ready, willing, and able to colonize ecosystems gets too small. (Advances in genetic engineering may well permit us to write a large number of additions to that "library.") In the United States as in many other parts of the world, however, the number of species has been increasing dramatically, not decreasing, as a result of human activity. This is because the hordes of exotic species coming into ecosystems in the United States far exceed the number of species that are becoming extinct. Indeed, introductions may outnumber extinctions by more than ten to one, so that the United States is becoming more and more species-rich all the time largely as a result of human action. n354 [\*908] Peter Vitousek and colleagues estimate that over 1000 non-native plants grow in California alone; in Hawaii there are 861; in Florida, 1210. n355 In Florida more than 1000 non-native insects, 23 species of mammals, and about 11 exotic birds have established themselves. n356 Anyone who waters a lawn or hoes a garden knows how many weeds desire to grow there, how many birds and bugs visit the yard, and how many fungi, creepy-crawlies, and other odd life forms show forth when it rains. All belong to nature, from wherever they might hail, but not many homeowners would claim that there are too few of them. Now, not all exotic species provide ecosystem services; indeed, some may be disruptive or have no instrumental value. n357 This also may be true, of course, of native species as well, especially because all exotics are native somewhere. Certain exotic species, however, such as Kentucky blue grass, establish an area's sense of identity and place; others, such as the green crabs showing up around Martha's Vineyard, are nuisances. n358 Consider an analogy [\*909] with human migration. Everyone knows that after a generation or two, immigrants to this country are hard to distinguish from everyone else. The vast majority of Americans did not evolve here, as it were, from hominids; most of us "came over" at one time or another. This is true of many of our fellow species as well, and they may fit in here just as well as we do. It is possible to distinguish exotic species from native ones for a period of time, just as we can distinguish immigrants from native-born Americans, but as the centuries roll by, species, like people, fit into the landscape or the society, changing and often enriching it. Shall we have a rule that a species had to come over on the Mayflower, as so many did, to count as "truly" American? Plainly not. When, then, is the cutoff date? Insofar as we are concerned with the absolute numbers of "rivets" holding ecosystems together, extinction seems not to pose a general problem because a far greater number of kinds of mammals, insects, fish, plants, and other creatures thrive on land and in water in America today than in prelapsarian times. n359 The Ecological Society of America has urged managers to maintain biological diversity as a critical component in strengthening ecosystems against disturbance. n360 Yet as Simon Levin observed, "much of the detail about species composition will be irrelevant in terms of influences on ecosystem properties." n361 [\*910] He added: "For net primary productivity, as is likely to be the case for any system property, **biodiversity matters only up to a point**; above a certain level, increasing biodiversity is likely to make **little difference**." n362 What about the use of plants and animals in agriculture? There is no scarcity foreseeable. "Of an estimated 80,000 types of plants [we] know to be edible," a U.S. Department of the Interior document says, "only about 150 are extensively cultivated." n363 About twenty species, not one of which is endangered, provide ninety percent of the food the world takes from plants. n364 Any new food has to take "shelf space" or "market share" from one that is now produced. Corporations also find it difficult to create demand for a new product; for example, people are not inclined to eat paw-paws, even though they are delicious. It is hard enough to get people to eat their broccoli and lima beans. It is harder still to develop consumer demand for new foods. This may be the reason the Kraft Corporation does not prospect in remote places for rare and unusual plants and animals to add to the world's diet. Of the roughly 235,000 flowering plants and 325,000 nonflowering plants (including mosses, lichens, and seaweeds) available, farmers ignore virtually all of them in favor of a very few that are profitable. n365 To be sure, any of the more than 600,000 species of plants could have an application in agriculture, but would they be preferable to the species that are now dominant? Has anyone found any consumer demand for any of these half-million or more plants to replace rice or wheat in the human diet? There are reasons that farmers cultivate rice, wheat, and corn rather than, say, Furbish's lousewort. There are many kinds of louseworts, so named because these weeds were thought to cause lice in sheep. How many does agriculture really require? [\*911] The species on which agriculture relies are domesticated, not naturally occurring; they are developed by artificial not natural selection; they might not be able to survive in the wild. n366 This argument is not intended to deny the religious, aesthetic, cultural, and moral reasons that command us to respect and protect the natural world. These spiritual and ethical values should evoke action, of course, but we should also recognize that they are spiritual and ethical values. We should recognize that ecosystems and all that dwell therein compel our moral respect, our aesthetic appreciation, and our spiritual veneration; we should clearly seek to achieve the goals of the ESA. There is no reason to assume, however, that these goals have anything to do with human well-being or welfare as economists understand that term. These are ethical goals, in other words, not economic ones. Protecting the marsh may be the right thing to do for moral, cultural, and spiritual reasons. We should do it-but someone will have to pay the costs. In the narrow sense of promoting human welfare, protecting nature often represents a net "cost," not a net "benefit." It is largely for moral, not economic, reasons-ethical, not prudential, reasons- that we care about all our fellow creatures. They are valuable as objects of love not as objects of use. What is good for   [\*912]  the marsh may be good in itself even if it is not, in the economic sense, good for mankind. The most valuable things are quite useless.

#### diseases cannot cause extinction because of burnout theory

**Gerber 5** (Leah R. Gerber, PhD. Associate Professor of Ecology, Evolution, and Environmental Sciences, Ecological Society of America, "Exposing Extinction Risk Analysis to Pathogens: Is Disease Just Another Form of Density Dependence?" August 2005, Jstor)

The density of it population is an important parameter for both PVA and host-pathogen theory. A fundamental principle of epidemiology is that the spread of an infectious disease through a population is a function of the density of both susceptible and infectious hosts. If infectious agents are supportable by the host species of conservation interest, the impact of a pathogen on a declining population is likely to decrease as the host population declines. A pathogen will spread when, on average, it is able to transmit to a susceptible host before an infected host dies or eliminates the infection (Kermack and McKendrick 1927, Anderson and May l99l). If the parasite affects the reproduction or mortality of its host, or the host is able to mount an immune response, the parasite population may eventually reduce the density of susceptible hosts to a level at which the rate of parasite increase is no longer positive. Most epidemiological models indicate that there is a host threshold density (or local population size) below which a parasite cannot invade, suggesting that rare or depleted species should be less subject to host-specific disease. This has implications for small, yet increasing, populations. For example, although endangered species at low density may be less susceptible to a disease outbreak, recovery to higher densities places them at increasing risk of future disease-related decline (e.g., southern sea otters; Gerber ct al. 2004). In the absence of stochastic factors (such as those modeled in PVA), and given the usual assumption of disease models that the chance that a susceptible host will become infected is proportional to the density of infected hosts (the mass action assumption) a host specific pathogen cannot drive its host to extinction (McCallum and Dobson 1995). Extinction in the absence of stochasticity is possible if alternate hosts (sometimes called reservoir hosts) relax the extent to which transmission depends on the density of the endangered host species.

## 2nc

#### Militaristic interventions conducted on behalf of US economic imperialism culminate in extinction

**Mészáros 3** (István, Hungarian Marxist philosopher, and Professor Emeritus at the University of Sussex. He held the Chair of Philosophy at Sussex for fifteen years and was earlier Professor of Philosophy and Social Science for four years at York University. The Monthly Review, “Militarism and the Coming Wars” June 2003. http://monthlyreview.org/0603meszaros.htm 7/9/09)

The dangers and immense suffering caused by all attempts at solving deep-seated social problems by **militaristic interventions**, on any scale, are obvious enough. If, however, we look more closely at the historical trend of militaristic adventures, it becomes frighteningly clear that they show an ever greater intensification and an ever-increasing scale, from local confrontations to two horrendous world wars in the twentieth century, and to the potential **annihilation of humankind** when we reach our own time. It is most relevant to mention in this context the distinguished Prussian military officer and practical as well as theoretical strategist, Karl Marie von Clausewitz (1780-1831), who died in the same year as Hegel; both of them killed by cholera. It was von Clausewitz, director of the Military School of Berlin in the last thirteen years of his life, who in his posthumously published book—Vom Kriege (On War, 1833)—offered a classic definition of the relationship between politics and war that is still frequently quoted: “war is the continuation of politics by other means.” This famous definition was tenable until quite recently, but has become totally untenable in our time. It assumed the rationality of the actions which connect the two domains of politics and war as the continuation of one another. In this sense, the war in question had to be winnable, at least in principle, even if miscalculations leading to defeat could be contemplated at the instrumental level. Defeat by itself could not destroy the rationality of war as such, since after the—however unfavorable—new consolidation of politics the defeated party could plan another round of war as the rational continuation of its politics by other means. Thus the absolute condition of von Clausewitz’s equation to be satisfied was the winnability of war in principle, so as to recreate the “eternal cycle” of politics leading to war, and back to politics leading to another war, and so on ad infinitum. The actors involved in such confrontations were the national states. No matter how monstrous the damage inflicted by them on their adversaries, and even on their own people (just remember Hitler!), the rationality of the military pursuit was guaranteed if the war could be considered winnable in principle. Today the situation is qualitatively different for two principal reasons. First, the objective of the feasible war at the present phase of historical development, in accordance with the objective requirements of imperialism—world domination by capital’s most powerful state, in tune with its own political design of ruthless authoritarian “globalization” (dressed up as “free exchange” in a U.S. ruled global market)—is ultimately unwinnable, foreshadowing, instead, the destruction of humankind. This objective by no stretch of imagination could be considered a rational objective in accord with the stipulated rational requirement of the “continuation of politics by other means” conducted by one nation, or by one group of nations against another. Aggressively imposing the will of one powerful national state over all of the others, even if for cynical tactical reasons the advocated war is absurdly camouflaged as a “purely limited war” leading to other “open ended limited wars,” can therefore be qualified only as total irrationality. The second reason greatly reinforces the first. For the weapons already available for waging the war or wars of the twenty first century are capable of exterminating not only the adversary but the whole of humanity, for the first time ever in history. Nor should we have the illusion that the existing weaponry marks the very end of the road. Others, even more instantly lethal ones, might appear tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. Moreover, threatening the use of such weapons is by now considered an acceptable state strategic device. Thus, put reasons one and two together, and the conclusion is inescapable: envisaging war as the mechanism of global government in today’s world underlines that we find ourselves at the precipice of absolute irrationality from which there can be no return if we accept the ongoing course of development. What was missing from von Clausewitz’s classic definition of war as the “continuation of politics by other means” was the investigation of the deeper underlying causes of war and the possibility of their avoidance. The challenge to face up to such causes is more urgent today than ever before. For the war of the twenty first century looming ahead of us is not only “not winnable in principle.” Worse than that, it is in principle unwinnable. Consequently, envisaging the pursuit of war, as the Bush administration’s September 17, 2002 strategic document does, make Hitler’s irrationality look like the model of rationality.

#### Studies proves that their impact predictions fail – vote neg on presumption

**Menand 5** (Louis, “Everybody’s an Expert,” The New Yorker, December 2005, http://www.newyorker.com/archive/2005/12/05/051205crbo\_books1?currentPage=1)

It is the somewhat gratifying lesson of Philip Tetlock’s new book, “Expert Political Judgment: How Good Is It? How Can We Know?” (Princeton; $35), that people who make prediction their business—people who appear as experts on television, get quoted in newspaper articles, advise governments and businesses, and participate in punditry roundtables—are no better than the rest of us. When they’re wrong, they’re rarely held accountable, and they rarely admit it, either. They insist that they were just off on timing, or blindsided by an improbable event, or almost right, or wrong for the right reasons. They have the same repertoire of self-justifications that everyone has, and are no more inclined than anyone else to revise their beliefs about the way the world works, or ought to work, just because they made a mistake. No one is paying you for your gratuitous opinions about other people, but the experts are being paid, and Tetlock claims that the better known and more frequently quoted they are, the less reliable their guesses about the future are likely to be. The accuracy of an **expert’s predictions** actually **has an inverse relationship to** his or her **self-confidence**, renown, and, beyond a certain point, depth of knowledge. People who follow current events by reading the papers and newsmagazines regularly can guess what is likely to happen about as accurately as the specialists whom the papers quote. Our system of expertise is completely inside out: it rewards bad judgments over good ones. “Expert Political Judgment” is not a work of media criticism. Tetlock is a psychologist—he teaches at Berkeley—and his conclusions are based on a long-term **study** that **he began twenty years ago**. He picked two hundred and eighty-four people who made their living “commenting or offering advice on political and economic trends,” and he started asking them to assess the probability that various things would or would not come to pass, both in the areas of the world in which they specialized and in areas about which they were not expert. Would there be a nonviolent end to apartheid in South Africa? Would Gorbachev be ousted in a coup? Would the United States go to war in the Persian Gulf? Would Canada disintegrate? (Many experts believed that it would, on the ground that Quebec would succeed in seceding.) And so on. By the end of the study, in 2003, the experts had made 82,361 forecasts. Tetlock also asked questions designed to determine how they reached their judgments, how they reacted when their predictions proved to be wrong, how they evaluated new information that did not support their views, and how they assessed the probability that rival theories and predictions were accurate.

Tetlock got a statistical handle on his task by putting most of the forecasting questions into a “three possible futures” form. The respondents were asked to rate the probability of three alternative outcomes: the persistence of the status quo, more of something (political freedom, economic growth), or less of something (repression, recession). And he measured his experts on two dimensions: how good they were at guessing probabilities (did all the things they said had an x per cent chance of happening happen x per cent of the time?), and how accurate they were at predicting specific outcomes. The results were unimpressive. On the first scale, the experts performed worse than they would have if they had simply assigned an equal probability to all three outcomes—if they had given each possible future a thirty-three-per-cent chance of occurring. Human beings who spend their lives studying the state of the world, in other words, **are poorer forecasters than dart-throwing monkeys**, who would have distributed their picks evenly over the three choices. Tetlock also found that specialists are not significantly more reliable than non-specialists in guessing what is going to happen in the region they study. Knowing a little might make someone a more reliable forecaster, but Tetlock found that knowing a lot can actually make a person less reliable. “We reach the point of diminishing marginal predictive returns for knowledge disconcertingly quickly,” he reports. “In this age of academic hyperspecialization, there is no reason for supposing that contributors to top journals—distinguished political scientists, area study specialists, economists, and so on—are any better than journalists or attentive readers of the New York Times in ‘reading’ emerging situations.” And the more famous the forecaster the more overblown the forecasts. “Experts in demand,” Tetlock says, “were more overconfident than their colleagues who eked out existences far from the limelight.” People who are not experts in the psychology of expertise are likely (I predict) to find Tetlock’s results a surprise and a matter for concern. For psychologists, though, nothing could be less surprising. “Expert Political Judgment” is just one of more than a hundred studies that have pitted experts against statistical or actuarial formulas, and in almost all of those studies the people either do no better than the formulas or do worse. In one study, college counsellors were given information about a group of high-school students and asked to predict their freshman grades in college. The counsellors had access to test scores, grades, the results of personality and vocational tests, and personal statements from the students, whom they were also permitted to interview. Predictions that were produced by a formula using just test scores and grades were more accurate. There are also many studies showing that expertise and experience do not make someone a better reader of the evidence. In one, data from a test used to diagnose brain damage were given to a group of clinical psychologists and their secretaries. The psychologists’ diagnoses were no better than the secretaries’. The experts’ trouble in Tetlock’s study is exactly the trouble that all human beings have: we fall in love with our hunches, and we really, really hate to be wrong. Tetlock describes an experiment that he witnessed thirty years ago in a Yale classroom. A rat was put in a T-shaped maze. Food was placed in either the right or the left transept of the T in a random sequence such that, over the long run, the food was on the left sixty per cent of the time and on the right forty per cent. Neither the students nor (needless to say) the rat was told these frequencies. The students were asked to predict on which side of the T the food would appear each time. The rat eventually figured out that the food was on the left side more often than the right, and it therefore nearly always went to the left, scoring roughly sixty per cent—D, but a passing grade. The students looked for patterns of left-right placement, and ended up scoring only fifty-two per cent, an F. The rat, having no reputation to begin with, was not embarrassed about being wrong two out of every five tries. But Yale students, who do have reputations, searched for a hidden order in the sequence. They couldn’t deal with forty-per-cent error, so they ended up with almost fifty-per-cent error. The expert-prediction game is not much different. When television pundits make predictions, the more ingenious their forecasts the greater their cachet. An arresting new prediction means that the expert has discovered a set of interlocking causes that no one else has spotted, and that could lead to an outcome that the conventional wisdom is ignoring. On shows like “The McLaughlin Group,” these experts never lose their reputations, or their jobs, because long shots are their business. More serious commentators differ from the pundits only in the degree of showmanship. These serious experts—the think tankers and area-studies professors—are not entirely out to entertain, but they are a little out to entertain, and both their status as experts and their appeal as performers require them to predict futures that are not obvious to the viewer. The producer of the show does not want you and me to sit there listening to an expert and thinking, I could have said that. The expert also suffers from knowing too much: the more facts an expert has, the more information is available to be enlisted in support of his or her pet theories, and the more chains of causation he or she can find beguiling. This helps explain why specialists fail to outguess non-specialists. The odds tend to be with the obvious. Tetlock’s experts were also no different from the rest of us when it came to learning from their mistakes. Most people tend to dismiss new information that doesn’t fit with what they already believe. Tetlock found that his experts used a double standard: they were much tougher in assessing the validity of information that undercut their theory than they were in crediting information that supported it. The same deficiency leads liberals to read only The Nation and conservatives to read only National Review. We are not natural falsificationists: we would rather find more reasons for believing what we already believe than look for reasons that we might be wrong. In the terms of Karl Popper’s famous example, to verify our intuition that all swans are white we look for lots more white swans, when what we should really be looking for is one black swan. Also, people tend to see the future as indeterminate and the past as inevitable. If you look backward, the dots that lead up to Hitler or the fall of the Soviet Union or the attacks on September 11th all connect. If you look forward, it’s just a random scatter of dots, many potential chains of causation leading to many possible outcomes. We have no idea today how tomorrow’s invasion of a foreign land is going to go; after the invasion, we can actually persuade ourselves that we knew all along. The result seems inevitable, and therefore predictable. Tetlock found that, consistent with this asymmetry, experts routinely misremembered the degree of probability they had assigned to an event after it came to pass. They claimed to have predicted what happened with a higher degree of certainty than, according to the record, they really did. When this was pointed out to them, by Tetlock’s researchers, they sometimes became defensive. And, like most of us, experts violate a fundamental rule of probabilities by tending to find scenarios with more variables more likely. If a prediction needs two independent things to happen in order for it to be true, its probability is the product of the probability of each of the things it depends on. If there is a one-in-three chance of x and a one-in-four chance of y, the probability of both x and y occurring is one in twelve. But we often feel instinctively that if the two events “fit together” in some scenario the chance of both is greater, not less. The classic “Linda problem” is an analogous case. In this experiment, subjects are told, “Linda is thirty-one years old, single, outspoken, and very bright. She majored in philosophy. As a student, she was deeply concerned with issues of discrimination and social justice and also participated in antinuclear demonstrations.” They are then asked to rank the probability of several possible descriptions of Linda today. Two of them are “bank teller” and “bank teller and active in the feminist movement.” People rank the second description higher than the first, even though, logically, its likelihood is smaller, because it requires two things to be true—that Linda is a bank teller and that Linda is an active feminist—rather than one. It was no news to Tetlock, therefore, that experts got beaten by formulas. But he does believe that he discovered something about why some people make better forecasters than other people. It has to do not with what the experts believe but with the way they think. Tetlock uses Isaiah Berlin’s metaphor from Archilochus, from his essay on Tolstoy, “The Hedgehog and the Fox,” to illustrate the difference. He says: Low scorers look like hedgehogs: thinkers who “know one big thing,” aggressively extend the explanatory reach of that one big thing into new domains, display bristly impatience with those who “do not get it,” and express considerable confidence that they are already pretty proficient forecasters, at least in the long term. High scorers look like foxes: thinkers who know many small things (tricks of their trade), are skeptical of grand schemes, see explanation and prediction not as deductive exercises but rather as exercises in flexible “ad hocery” that require stitching together diverse sources of information, and are rather diffident about their own forecasting prowess. A hedgehog is a person who sees international affairs to be ultimately determined by a single bottom-line force: balance-of-power considerations, or the clash of civilizations, or globalization and the spread of free markets. A hedgehog is the kind of person who holds a great-man theory of history, according to which the Cold War does not end if there is no Ronald Reagan. Or he or she might adhere to the “actor-dispensability thesis,” according to which Soviet Communism was doomed no matter what. Whatever it is, the big idea, and that idea alone, dictates the probable outcome of events. For the hedgehog, therefore, predictions that fail are only “off on timing,” or are “almost right,” derailed by an unforeseeable accident. There are always little swerves in the short run, but the long run irons them out.

#### Use your ballot as a site to contest Eurocentric knowledge production --- they perpetuate a curriculum of imperialism --- it’s not just about debating but who has the best method for making our debates inclusive and productive --- I am sorry that this card is long but it is awesome.

Baker 8—Michael, University of Rochester, “Eurocentrism and the Modern/Colonial Curriculum: Towards a Post-Eurocentric Math & Science Education – A Critical Interpretive Review,” http://www.academia.edu/1517810/Towards\_a\_Post-Eurocentric\_Math\_and\_Science\_Education\_--\_A\_Critical\_Interpretive\_Review)//A-Berg

This essay reviews literature in science and mathematics education that assumes the possibilities for knowing the realities of the world through **the official curriculum** are reductively maintained within a Eurocentric cultural complex (Carnoy, 1974; Swartz, 1992;Willinsky, 1998). Eurocentrism will be described as the **epistemic framework** of colonial modernity, a framework through which western knowledge enabled and legitimated **the global imposition of one** particular **conception** of the world over all others. Eurocentrism is an ethnocentric projection onto the world that expresses the ways the west and thewesternized have learned to conceive and perceive the world. At the center of this ethnocentric projection are the **control of knowledge** and the maintenance of the conditions of epistemic dependency (Mignolo, 2000a).¶ Every conception of the “world” involves epistemological and ontological presuppositions interrelated with particular (historical and cultural) ways of knowing and being. All forms of knowledge uphold practices and constitute subjects (Santos, 2007a).**What counts as knowledge** and what it means to be human are profoundly interrelated(Santos, 2006). The knowledge that counts in the modern school curriculum, fromkindergarten to graduate school, is largely constructed and contained within an epistemic framework that is constitutive of the monocultural worldview and ideological project of western modernity (Meyer, Kamens & Benavot, 1992; Wallerstein, 1997, 2006; Lander,2002; Kanu, 2006; Kincheloe, 2008; Battiste, 2008). The monocultural worldview andethos of western civilization are based in part upon structures of knowledge and an epistemic framework elaborated and maintained within a structure of **power/knowledge relations** involved in five hundred years of European imperial/colonial domination(Quijano, 1999, p. 47). If our increasingly interconnected and interdependent world is also to become more and not less democratic, **schools** and teachers **must** learn to **incorporate** theworldwide **diversity of knowledges** and ways of being (multiple epistemologies and ontologies) occluded by the hegemony of Eurocentrism. Academic knowledge andunderstanding should be complemented with learning from those who are living in andthinking from colonial and postcolonial legacies (Mignolo, 2000, p. 5).¶ Too many children and adults today (particularly those from non-dominant groups)continue to be alienated and marginalized within modern classrooms where knowledge and learning are unconsciously permeated by this imperial/colonial conception of the world. The reproduction of personal and cultural inferiority inherent in the modern educational project of monocultural assimilation is interrelated with **the hegemony of western knowledge structures** that are largely taken for granted within Eurocentric education (Dei,2008). Thus, in the field of education, “we need to learn again how five centuries of studying, classifying, and ordering humanity within an imperial context gave rise to peculiar and powerful ideas of race, culture, and nation that were, in effect, conceptual instruments that the West used both to divide up and to educate the world” (Willinsky,1998, pp. 2-3). The epistemic and conceptual apparatus through which the modern worldwas divided up and modern education was institutionalized is located in the culturalcomplex called “Eurocentrism”.¶ Western education institutions and the modern curriculum, from the sixteenthcentury into the present, were designed to reproduce this Eurocentric imaginary under thesign of “civilization” (Grafton & Jardine, 1986; Butts, 1967, 1973). Eurocentric knowledge lies **at the center** of an imperial and colonial model of civilization that now threatens to destroy the conditions that make life possible (Lander, 2002, p. 245). From a post-Eurocentric interpretive horizon (described below), the present conditions of knowledge are embedded within a hegemonic knowledge apparatus that emerged withEuropean colonialism and imperialism in the sixteenth century (Philopose, 2007;Kincheloe, 2008).¶ Based upon hierarchical competition for power, control, and supremacy among the“civilized” nation-states, imperialism is an original and inherent characteristic of themodern western interstate system that emerged with the formation of sovereign Europeanterritorial states in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Wallerstein, 1973; Gong, 1984 ;Hindness, 2005; Agnew, 2003; Taylor & Flint, 2000). Closely interrelated withimperialism, colonialism involves a civilizing project within an ideological formation established to construct the way the world is known and understood, particularly through the production, representation, and organization of knowledge (Mignolo, 2000a; Kanu,2006). Colonialism **reduces reality** to the **single dimension** of the colonizer. **Colonialism and imperialism impose** on the world **one discourse**, one form of conscience, one science, **one way of being** in the world. “Post-colonial analysis leads to a simple realization: that theeffect of the colonizing process over individuals, over culture and society throughoutEurope’s domain was vast, and produced consequences as complex as they are profound”(Ashcroft, 2001a, p. 24).¶ In yet to be acknowledged ways, the Eurocentric curriculum, and western schoolingin general, are profoundly interrelated with both modern imperialism and colonialism.The persistence and continuity of Eurocentrism rather leads one to see it asa part of a habitus of imperial subjectivity that manifests itself in a particular kind of attitude”: the European attitude – a subset of a more encompassing “imperial attitude.” The Eurocentric attitude combines the search for theoria with the mythical fixation with roots and the assertion of imperial subjectivity. It produces and defends what Enrique Dussel hasreferred to as “the myth of modernity” (Maldonado-Torres, 2005b, p. 43). ¶ Western schooling reproduces this “Eurocentric attitude” in complicity with a globalizedsystem of power/knowledge relations, tacitly based upon white heterosexual malesupremacy (Kincheloe, 1998; Allen, 2001; Bonilla-Silva, 2001, 2006; Twine & Gallagher,2008; Akom, 2008a, 2008b). Eurocentrism is a hegemonic representation and mode of knowing that relies on confusion between abstract universality and concrete world hegemony (Escobar, 2007; Dussel, 2000; Quijano, 1999, 2000). Worldwide imperialexpansion and European colonialism led to the late nineteenth century worldwidehegemony of Eurocentrism (Quijano, 2005, p. 56). **Eurocentrism**, in other words, **refers to the hegemony of a (universalized**) Euro-Anglo-American **epistemological framework that governs** both **the production** and meanings **of knowledges** and subjectivities throughout the world (Schott, 2001; Kincheloe, 2008).¶ Eurocentrism is an epistemological model that organizes the state, the economy,gender and sexuality, subjectivity, and knowledge (Quijano, 2000). The production of **Eurocentrism is maintained** in specific political, economic, social and cultural institutions and **institutionalized practices** that began to emerge with the colonization of the Americasin the sixteenth century. The nation-state, the bourgeois family, the capitalist corporation, Eurocentric rationality, and western educational institutions are all examples of worldwideinstitutions and institutionalized practices that contribute to the production of Eurocentrism (Quijano, 2008, pp. 193-194).¶ Eurocentrism as a historical phenomenon is not to be understood withoutreference to the structures of power that EuroAmerica produced over thelast five centuries, which in turn produced Eurocentrism, globalized itseffects, and universalized its historical claims. Those structures of power include the economic (capitalism, capitalist property relations, markets andmodes of production, imperialism, etc.) the political (a system of nation-states, and the nation-form, most importantly, new organizations to handle problems presented by such a reordering of the world, new legal forms,etc.), the social (production of classes, genders, races, ethnicities, religiousforms as well as the push toward individual-based social forms), andcultural (including new conceptions of space and time, new ideas of thegood life, and a new developmentalist conception of the life-world) (Dirlik,1999, p. 8).¶ Eurocentric thinking is embedded in the concepts and categories through which the modernworld has been constructed. “The West defines what is, for example, freedom, progress and civil behavior; law, tradition and community; reason, mathematics and science; what is real and what it means to be human. The non-Western civilizations have simply to accept these definitions or be defined out of existence” (Sardar, 1999, p. 44).¶ The mostly **taken-for-granted definitions** and conceptual boundaries of the academic disciplines and school subjects such as “philosophy”, “math”, “science”,“history”, “literature”, “literacy”, “humanities”, “education” **are all Eurocentric constructions**. If Eurocentrism is intrinsic in the way we think and conceptualize, it is also inherent in **the way we organize knowledge**. Virtually all the disciplines of social sciences, from economics to anthropology, emerged when Europe was formulating its worldview, and virtually all are geared to serving the need and requirements of Western society and promoting its outlook. **Eurocentrism is entrenched in the way these disciplines are structured**, the concepts and categories they use for analysis, and the way progress is defined with the disciplines (Joseph et al. 1990) (Sardar, 1999, p. 49).¶ This hegemonic knowledge formation envelops the modern school curriculum within an imperial/**colonial paradigm legitimated** by the rhetoric of modernity (i.e., equal opportunity, mobility, achievement gap, meritocracy, progress, development, civilization,globalization). Western education (colonial and metropolitan) reproduces imperial/colonial, monocultural, and deluded conceptions of and ways of being in the world (Mignolo, 2000a; Kincheloe, 2008). “The effect of Eurocentrism is not merely that it excludes knowledges and experiences outside of Europe, but that it obscures the very nature and history of Europe itself” (Dussel, 1993). Understanding Eurocentrism thus involves recognizing and denaturalizing the implicitly assumed conceptual apparatus and definitional powers of the west (Sardar, 1999, p. 44; Coronil, 1996). Individually,understanding Eurocentrism may also involve the experience of disillusionment and cultureshock as one begins to demythologize the dense mirage of modernity.¶ Yet, today, in the academic field of education, “Eurocentrism” is commonlyunderstood as a cultural perspective among political conservatives who ascribe to thesuperiority of western contributions (e.g., scientific, cultural and artistic) to world ivilization that in turn justify the continued exclusion of non-European cultures andknowledges in the curriculum (Collins & O’Brien, 2003). Understanding Eurocentrism as a conservative perspective on western culture and education ignores the historical claim that **Eurocentrism is the framework for the production and control of knowledge** – thatEurocentrism is the way the “modern” world has been constructed as a cultural projection.For many of us educated in the western tradition – within this still dominantepistemological framework -- a Eurocentric worldview may be all we know. We may not recognize that our enlightened, liberal versus conservative, university educated ways of thinking, knowing, and being are a reflection of a particular historical-cultural-epistemological world-view, different from and similar to a variety of other equally valid and valuable ways of knowing and being (Santos, 2007; Battiste, 2008). In other words, if we are “well educated”, we conceive, perceive, interpret, know, learn about, and (re)produce knowledge of the “world” through an ethnocentric cultural projection known as “Eurocentrism” (Ankomah, 2005).¶ This review begins therefore by situating Eurocentrism within the historical context of its emergence – colonial modernity – and proceeds to define Eurocentrism as the epistemic framework of colonial modernity. From this decolonial (or post-Eurocentric)historical horizon and framing of Eurocentrism, the second part will frame and review literature on the critique of Eurocentrism within mathematics and science education that represent alternatives to the hegemony of western knowledge in the classroom. This literature was searched for and selected because it provides critiques of Eurocentrism that include specific proposals for de-centering and pluralizing the school curriculum. The review concludes by summarizing, situating, and appropriating these two school subject proposals within a vision for a post-Eurocentric curriculum. In framing, selecting, andreviewing literature that challenges and reconceptualizes the underlying Eurocentric assumptions of the modern school curriculum, this literature review adopts from critical philosophical (Haggerson, 1991), interpretive (Eisenhardt, 1998), and creative processapproaches (Montuori, 2005). The rationale for this two-part organization, as well as thetype of review this rationale calls for deserve further clarification, before analyzing the historical context of Eurocentrism.¶ Methodological and Theoretical Rationale¶ Conventional literature reviews seek to synthesize ideas as overviews of knowledge to date in order to prefigure further research (Murray & Raths, 1994; Boote & Beile, 2005).Eisenhardt (1998) however, describes another purpose of literature reviews as interpretive tools to “capture insight ….suggesting how and why various contexts and circumstances inform particular meanings and reveal alternative ways of making sense (p. 397).Following Eisenhardt’s description, this unconventional literature review is intended to situate and review an emergent literature on a post-Eurocentric curriculum within an historical analysis of Eurocentrism. A post-Eurocentric interpretive horizon is described that provides an alternative way of making sense of the curriculum literature. Eurocentric modernity is the historical context within which the modern curriculum is conceived. Mostuses of term Eurocentrism within the curriculum literature have yet to include analyses of the origins and meaning of Eurocentrism within the history and project of modernity. This lack of recognition and analysis of the historical context of Eurocentrism contributes to both incoherence and impotency in the use of this critical concept (for examples see Mahalingam, 2000; Gutierrez, 2000; Aikenhead & Lewis, 2001).¶ The concepts Eurocentrism and post-Eurocentrism offer contrasting paradigms through which the curriculum can be evaluated in relation to whether teaching and learning reproduces or decolonizes the dominant modern/colonial system of power/knowledge relations. The successful development and implementation of a post-Eurocentric curriculum is dependent upon an adequate historical-philosophical interpretation of Eurocentrism. As such, this literature review adopts elements from the critical philosophical, interpretive, and creative process approaches (Haggerson, 1991; Eisenhardt,1999; Livingston, 1999; Meacham, 1998; Schwandt, 1998; Montuori, 2005). Eisenhardt describes interpretive reviews as presenting information that “disrupts conventional thinking” and seeks to “reveal alternative ways of making sense” (Eisenhardt, 1999, p. 392, 397). Haggerson’s critical philosophical inquiry attempts to give meaning and enhance understanding of activities and institutions, bringing their norms of governance to consciousness, and finding criteria by which to make appropriate judgments (Haggerson, 1991). Montouri’s creative process model includes problematizing the underlying presuppositions of a field of inquiry along with creating new frameworks for reinterpreting bodies of knowledge (Montouri, 2005). This review does not describe and compare different perspectives. This review instead presents an alternative, post-Eurocentric framework for reinterpreting the modern Eurocentric curriculum, with a specific focus on math and science education. This post-Eurocentric framework provides an alternative way of thinking about school knowledge whereby the entire spectrum of different perspectives can be re-viewed in relation to each other.

**Policy focus mystifies colonialism and turns debate into regurgitating imperialistic scholarship**

**Robinson and Gindin 05** - Jonah Gindin is a Canadian journalist living and working in Caracas, Venezuela, William I Robinson is professor of sociology at the University of California, Santa Barbara, “The Battle for Global Civil Society,” June 13th 2005, http://web.archive.org/web/20130314033424/http://venezuelanalysis.com/analysis/1186)//A-Berg

\*\*The website this was originally posted on was taken down, but DHeidt managed to find it in the web archive.

But **intellectuals** – who are never free-floating, always attached to the projects of dominant or of subordinate groups—they **have a false consciousness**. Perhaps Gramsci was giving the benefit of the doubt to these intellectuals. There are many respectable and well-intentioned **academics from the “First World**” who unfortunately trumpet the new modalities of U.S. intervention conducted as “democracy promotion,” and others who **deceive themselves**, intentionally or otherwise, **into believing they can participate** intellectually – or directly – **in U.S. political intervention** in order to somehow steer it into a wholesome or acceptable foreign policy. We should recall that intellectual labor is never neutral or divorced from competing and antagonistic social interests. To state this in overly harsh terms, some—perhaps many—academics who defend U.S. “democracy promotion” are organic intellectuals of the transnational elite. Some are outright opportunists who know before whom they need to prostrate themselves in order to secure funding and status in the halls of global power. They are intellectual mercenaries. Others, as I’ve said, are well intentioned. But there is almost always an arrogance of power and privilege that many first world intellectuals bring to their “study” of the global South; there is an **academic colonial mentality** at work. Let’s face it: so-called “democracy promotion” has become a veritable academic industry that has numerous organic, ideological, and funding links with the U.S. intervention apparatus. Let us recall that projects of domination always have their organic intellectuals. The prevailing global order has attracted many **intellectual defenders, academics, pundits, and ideologues**, who in the end serve to **mystify the** real **inner workings of the emerging order** and the social and political interests embedded therein. These **intellectuals have become central cogs in** the system of global capitalist **domination**. Maybe they want a global capitalism with a more “human face,” but in the end they not only help to legitimize this system but also provide technical solutions in response to the problems and contradictions of the system. How can any academic actually follow what the U.S. does around the world in the name of “democracy promotion” and not acknowledge the blatant farce? These are harsh words, but we must ask, what is the role and responsibility of intellectuals in the face of the global crisis, the crisis of civilizational proportions we face in 2005.

**. Their whole competitiveness advantage relies on cultural and epistemic binaries that legitimize structures of violence.**

**Taylor 12** - Lecturer in Latin American Studies BA University of London, Queen Mary MPhil University of Glasgow PhD University of Manchester, (Lucy, “Decolonizing International Relations: Perspectives from Latin America,” International Studies Review, Volume 14, Issue 3, 11 SEP 2012, 14, 386–400, Wiley Online Library)//A-Berg

My decolonial approach involves revealing the operation of coloniality⁄modernity, and this leads me to recognize and destabilize two intertwined binaries that have helped to generate the status of the United States in its position of global powerfulness. This position is of course determined by the US’ economic dominance and military might, but also its standing in the global arena is conditioned by its image as a coherent and progressive nation. This image calls on (at least) two **dialogues of othering**, which are configured through coloniality and respond to hierarchies of knowledge and race: firstly, ‘‘domestic’’ coloniality and the Native American other; secondly, ‘‘international’’ coloniality and the Latin American other. Revealing the operation of coloniality serves to problematize the naturalness of these ‘‘American’’ hierarchies and unsettles our image of the USA, opening ways to contest its superiority. Here, I am adopting the strategy of provincialization advocated by Nayak and Selbin, but I am not proposing to provincialize from a very different epistemological position (as Chakrabarty (2000) did with reference to Europe and India, for example) but from a place that offers many similarities. These similarities stem from their shared place in the development of modernity⁄coloniality and capitalism, their social and cultural roots in the colonial encounter, and the ongoing dynamics of racial and epistemological inequality. Viewing the USA from a perspective which begins in the long sixteenth century allows us to reveal and disrupt binaried thinking and question global hierarchies; that this involves rethinking the USA makes it of primary relevance for a decolonial IR. From a coloniality of power perspective embedded in contemporary Latin America, the most obvious binary which contributes to US dominance is the Native/settler binary. The USA was constructed through a process in which the superiority of northern European settler people and their worldviews was asserted over Native American societies. This took the form of on-going territorial, economic, and **epistemological conquest** over Native peoples throughout the period, but perhaps the most formative experience, according to Shari Huhndorf, was the drive West in the nineteenth century (2001). This pivotal moment of struggle and national myth formation consolidated the US nationstate in terms of territory, migration, and economic expansion, as well as solidifying its national identity (Huhndorf 2001: 19–64; Bender 2006: 193–241). The colonial project of western expansion was characterized by **massacres**, displacement, and deception, which decimated Native communities and asserted the settlers’ military, political, and epistemological dominance (D’Errico 2001). As land was settled, the country became subdued and the enclosure of Native Americans in Reservations served to confirm the hegemonic dominance of a nationstate, which could set the terms of limited Native autonomy (Ostler 2004). Moreover, the mythology of the White pioneer who built ranches and towns in the wilderness attempted to displace the Native peoples from their status of original Americans (Agnew and Sharp 2002; Wolfe 2006). This domination was territorial but also epistemic and ethnic, then, and the success, coherence, and completeness of political domination and ethnic silencing played a direct role in generating a coherent and complete vision of ‘‘America’’. Thus, and in the words of Frederick Jackson Turner in 1893, ‘‘Moving westward, the frontier became more and more American’’ (quoted in Huhndorf 2005: 56). This dominance was confirmed by the capacity of US culture to appropriate Native imagery and practices in a wide range of scenarios from the movies to Scouting via World Fairs and fashion (Huhndorf 2001: 19–78, 162–202). Native Americans have never ceased to resist this onslaught and to express the agonies of the colonial wound and the fresh imaginaries of the colonial difference (Alfred and Corntassel 2005; Tyeeme Clark and Powell 2008), but the ‘‘success’’ of the American Dream made for the dominance of the hegemonic settler culture (Churchill 1997). The second dynamic of coloniality which has helped to generate US powerfulness was the emergence of the north/south binary, hinged at the US–Mexico border zone, with its economic, political, and racial dynamics. This binary developed particularly in the nineteenth century as the USA emerged to powerfulness but it is rooted in colonial rivalries. The colonial heritage of Latin America was derived mostly from a Catholic and southern Spanish empire, which during the long sixteenth century lost spiritual and political power in Europe to the protestant north, led by the British (who went on to become the pre-eminent colonial power). The conquistadores were branded with the ‘‘Black Legend’’ of Spanish colonialism by an emerging intelligentsia who painted themselves as enlightened bringers of progress, in contrast to the despotic, violent, lazy, and exploitative Spanish (Powell 1971: 39–59; Weber 2005: 2). In the USA, they chose to overlook the century of Spanish colonization of the North, and popular histories came to mark the birth of ‘‘America’’ with the arrival of the English Pilgrim Fathers on the Mayflower (Horwitz 2009). This sense of superiority linked to a British colonial heritage was compounded by perceived **racial inferiority of Latin America**n elites who were descended from ‘‘darker’’ Europeans to the south and presided over countries with large indigenous and mestizo (mixed-heritage) populations (Leys Stepan 1991: 45; Goldberg 2009). The superiority of a ‘‘White’’ and protestant USA seemed to be confirmed by the contrasting fortunes of South and North America: While Spain fell to Napoleonic rule and lost most of its colonies during the 1810s, the expanding USA acquired Louisiana (1812), Florida (1819) and New Mexico, Arizona, California, Nevada, Utah, and sections of Colorado (1848)––much of it formerly under Spanish rule (Mignolo 2005: 49–82). An ascendant USA took up the role of regional policeman expressed through the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, donning the mantle of Western supremacism which was being exercised by the Old World powers across Africa and Asia. The United States went on to take possession of the Philippines in 1898 and intensified its interest in Nicaragua, Panama, Guatemala, and Cuba, among others, at the same time. The economic benefits which accrued from such a role were, of course, also very significant (Robinson 1996; Livingstone 2009). This policing role was expanded by the Roosevelt Corollary of 1904, which staked the United States’ claim to be a global actor, a claim which was reinforced by interventionist foreign policy actions across the region (Ryan 2000: 40–54; Murphy 2005). From an angle which foregrounds coloniality and the powerfulness of racial– epistemic hierarchies, then, the rise of the USA to global powerfulness occurs in dialogue with countries to the south which were understood to be racially inferior and economically fair game for an expanding USA which sought to protect and enhance its interests (Ryan 2000: 1–10). Thus, Latin America is a crucial site for launching the US’ career as a global agent, economic powerhouse, norm advocate, and keeper of ‘‘the peace,’’ a site which is framed by dynamics of race and colonialism. Understanding US powerfulness demands, then, that IR take seriously not only its economic imperialism and interventionist bullying, but the coloniality of that power relationship, replete with epistemological and racial dimensions. Indeed, taking seriously the coloniality of power implies asking how its domestic and international dimensions are linked. By looking beyond the confines of ‘‘domestic’’ and ‘‘international,’’ we can perceive continuities in the exercise of coloniality and the operation the European epistemic project. For example, Huhndorf argues that the completion of the westward expansion and ‘‘solution’’ of the Indian Problem spelled trouble for a US identity that was made vivid through conquest. Sustaining and building that identity (and the economic and geopolitical power which was accrued by the expropriation of land) required that new frontiers be breached, which could recreate the energizing effects of dominating the barbarian (Huhndorf 2005: 61–4). It was in this spirit, she argues, that the United States took possession of the Philippines and intensified its interest in Central America and the Caribbean. In this way, the practice of coloniality by the US settler elite shifted southwards and took on imperial dimensions.

#### They say they don’t defend the worst parts of heg --- This is a link --- they use euphemistic language to justify the atrocities of imperialism.

**Porotsky 13** (Sophia Porotsky, MA honors candidate in international relations at the University of St Andrews, April 26th, 2013, “Pax Americana: The Successful Securitization of the Triple Threat of Terrorism, “Outlaw” Regimes, and Weapons of Mass Destruction,” <http://www.academia.edu/3482477/Pax_Americana_The_Successful_Securitization_of_the_Triple_Threat_of_Terrorism_Outlaw_Regimes_and_Weapons_of_Mass_Destruction>) gz

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

**This is a ruse to increase foreign domination of markets and create unequal economic ties.**

**Hart 02** – John and Rebecca Moores Distinguished Professor of History at U Houston, (John Mason, Empire and Revolution: The Americans in Mexico since the Civil War, 04/2002, eBook)//A-Berg

The American experience in Mexico offers a partial answer to the question of why the United States has so frequently supported oppressive tyrants with material aid, even while criticizing other governments for doing the same. Over1'iding material concerns, specifically the desire to extract wealth without opposition despite moral pronouncements, prompted financiers, railroad men, and ranchers to support military strongman Diaz against democratically elected Lerdo. Subsequently they backed Victo1'iano Huerta. Wilson supported Huerta with arms for over six months, hoping that the Mexican dictator could restore order; because he respected American property interests. Next the American financial elite briefly supported Francisco Villa but then shifted to Carranza as the lesser of two evils. Finally they lent their support to Alvaro Obregên Salido and Plutarcho Elias Calles. In every case the powerful Americans in the private sector had a far-reaching influence on official U.S. policy. During the 19905 those sectors of the American business community seeking relief from the demands of American labor supported President Bill Clinton and Treasury Secretary Robe1't E. Rubin in the approval of NAFTA. Meanwhile, they rushed to help Presidents Carlos Salinas de Gortari and Ernesto Zedillo Ponce de Leon in their p1'ivatization efforts. The American elites' continuing interest in access to strategic resources in other parts of the world is an integral part of U.S. policymaking. The interests of elite American property holders and investors has been the most important factor in relations between the United States and other nations throughout the Western Hemisphere, outweighing objections to dictatorships in the countries in question even in the cases represented by "Papa Doc" Duvaliel; the Somoza patriarchs, and the Argentine, Brazilian, Chilean, Uruguayan, and Central American generals of the 19705 and 19805. Although the CIA-supported overthrow of the democratic government of Guatemala in 19 54, the boycott of Nicaraguan products in 1980, and the ensuing support for the Contras were explained by the U.S. government in purely political terms, it is clear that a perceived nationalistic danger to the elaborate structure of American land ownership and trade hegemony in Central Ame1'ica was the deeper concern. Cooperative collaborating elites gained power as a result of U.S. intervention. In Africa, Ame1'ican support for the deployment of Belgian troops in Zaire by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization du1'ing the early 19605 provides another example of a misleading political emphasis given to strategies rooted in the effort to control strategic resources. Zaire contained one of the world's largest copper producing complexes, and American support for the creation of a client state run by a right-wing dictator instead of his nationalistic and left-wing counterpart ensured continued Western ownership of the copper mines. The violent, CIA-supported overthrow of the Sukarno government in oil-rich Indonesia underscores the mix of political and economic considerations behind American activism in the creation of client regimes. American corporate leaders and liberal and conservative U.S. administrations have worked with these antidemocratic regimes, including Nigeria in the mid 1990s, because they supported private enterprise and free trade, which were controlled by American elites. Middle-class Americans were also a strong cultural force in Mexico, and they remain so today. During the twentieth century their actions and attitudes reinforced the Mexicans' need to participate more fully in public affairs. Today American immigrants-retirees, spouses, scholars, students, and workers-continue to bring the American dream to Mexico. Their complexity of interests and activities sometimes creates an impression of fractionalization. Yet if we remember that most applied themselves to an occupation in order to survive, then we will understand why the main thrust of day-to-day middle-class American activity in Mexico has been in the workplace and in home life. This vision of individualism, competition, efficiency, religious practice, free markets, social mobility and democracy was and continues to be passed to Mexico's people with an intensity possible only between neighbors. As Americans have immigrated to Mexico on a massive scale, Hollywood movies, television shows, fast-food joints, baseball, blues, disco, jazz, and folk and rap music have permeated Mexican culture. The American dream represents a unique mix in which Western ideas about progress and individualism combine with a preoccupation with individual perfectibility and a belief that consumerism represents the ultimate path to human happiness. These American values and ideals transcend even the attraction of electoral democracy and political liberty. At its deepest level the American dream teaches that individuals are perfectible when emphasis is placed on education, personal and public hygiene, and physical fitness. The search for individual happiness has an even more common course. It is achieved through the materialism that developed alongside the growth of American businesses, first in Mexico during the late nineteenth century and now in the rest of the Third World. Happiness through consumerism is achieved by competition, efficiency and productivity. In daily life the people of Mexico and the Third World learn these lessons via advertising, television programs, and Hollywood movies that promise fulfillment through the acquisition of elegant clothing and sporty cars. The new individualism has replaced the community and family economic and cultural commitments once found in the traditional villages of the countryside.A major cultural component of the change has been the rise of Protestantism. The American Protestant sects that grew in Mexico during the nineteenth century are now flourishing in Brazil and Guatemala and spreading to the rest of Latin America. It relieves individuals of the responsibility to donate their savings to community welfare through fiesta rituals, and it offers them the right to communicate directly with God, removing the village priests from their mediating role between the deity and the people.2 America is an imperial force in Mexico because U.S. government authorities and privileged American citizens assert their power there in search of advantages. Beyond their personal resources, they use the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and multinational banks and corporations as instruments of that power. With their demands for reducing investment in social programs that would benefit Mexico's citizens and awarding budget priorities to debt payments for foreign creditors, the leaders of these institutions emphasize the goal of development. This ideology distinguishes them from middle-class Americans who hold more democratic beliefs. The elites who participate in these institutions are distinct from their counterparts during the age of European colonialism, when the rich and powerful sought the direct exploitation of openly enslaved peoples. The attempts to link the economies and peoples of Mexico and the United States have always been problematic and sometimes disastrous, but they have also been mutually beneficial. The benefits, howeven are lopsided, since the continuing relationship indicates roles for Mexican labor in American inclustrialism and American capital in the Mexican marketplace. Probable benefits include an increased per capita output for Mexico, which could potentially relieve the Mexican government of its onerous national debt by creating a larger economic base and providing a substantial marketplace for both A1ne1'icans and Mexicans. The challenge of and problem with NAFTA, however, lie in the idea of economic growth induced and effectively controlled by capitalists from out-side Mexico rather than from within. Under the coordinated plan of trade and investments represented by ADRs and NAFTA, the Mexican leaders are attempting to bypass the gradual, centuries-long, internalized process of commercial and then industrial growth that acculturated the peoples of Western Europe, the United States, and Iapan. Mexican prosperity, like that of the Four Tigers of Asia, depends upon outside investments and buyers and oscillates accordingly. In Mexico's case the outsiders are Americans. Unlike the Four Tigers, Mexico is a geographically large and socially diverse nation. It has the world's thirteenth largest economy and a population of approximately 1oo,ooo,ooo, half of whom live in what the government admits is extreme poverty. The rural population-30 percent of Mexico's citizens-lacks educational opportunities and will not be able to participate in an economic expansion in either the short or the mid term, except as menial laborers.

### 1nc technology

#### The aff’s approach to technology is a claim to the West’s technological superiority. It is not a question of technology being good or inevitable but the way that the epistemic base of Eurocentrism adopts it to provide certainty to its monopolistic claims.

**Dinerstein 2006** – (Joel, Technology and Its Discontents: On the Verge of the Posthuman, muse, American Quarterly, Volume 58, Number 3)//a-berg

Technology has long been the unacknowledged source of European and Euro-American superiority within modernity, and its underlying mythos always traffics in what James W. Carey once called “secular religiosity.”3 Lewis Mumford called the American belief system “mechano-idolatry” as early as 1934; a few years later he deemed it our “mechano-centric religion.” David F. Noble calls this ideology “the religion of technology” in a work of the same name that traces its European roots to a doctrine that combines millenarian- ism, rationalism, and Christian redemption in the writings of monks, explor- ers, inventors, and NASA scientists. If we take into account the functions of religion and not its rituals, it is not a deity who insures the American future but new technologies: smart bombs in the Gulf War, Viagra and Prozac in the pharmacy, satellite TV at home. It is not social justice or equitable eco- nomic distribution that will reduce hunger, greed, and poverty, but fables of abundance and the rhetoric of **technological utopianism**. The United States is in thrall to “techno-fundamentalism,” in Siva Vaidhyanathan’s apt phrase; to Thomas P. Hughes, “a god named technology has possessed Americans.” Or, as public policy scholar Edward Wenk Jr. sums it up, “we are . . . inclined to equate technology with civilization [itself ].”4 Technology as an abstract concept functions as a white mythology. Yet schol- ars of whiteness rarely engage technology as a site of dominant white cultural practices (except in popular culture), and scholars of technology often sidestep the subtext of whiteness within this mythos. The underlying ideology and cultural practices of technology were central to American studies scholarship in its second and third generations, but the field has marginalized this critical framework; it is as if these works of (mostly) white men are now irrelevant to the field’s central concerns of race, class, gender, sexuality, and ethnic identity on the one hand, and power, empire, and nation on the other. In this essay I will integrate some older works into the field’s current concerns to situate the current posthuman discourse within an unmarked white tradition of technological utopianism that also functions as a form of social evasion. By the conclusion, I hope to have shown that the posthuman is an escape from the panhuman. This is an important moment to grapple with the relationship of technol- ogy and whiteness since many scientists, inventors, and cognitive philosophers currently hail the arrival of the “posthuman.” This emergent term represents the imminent transformation of the human body through GNR technolo- gies—G for genetic engineering or biotechnology, N for nanotechnology, and R for robotics. “The posthuman,” as N. Katherine Hayles defined it in How We Became Posthuman (2000), “implies not only a coupling with intelligent machines but a coupling so intense and multifaceted that it is no longer pos- sible to distinguish meaningfully between the biological organism and the informational circuits in which the organism is enmeshed.” To be reductive, the posthuman envisions the near future as one in which humans are cyborgs—in which the human organism is, for all practical purposes, a networked being composed of multiple human-machine interfaces. Underlying cultural beliefs in technological determinism matched with the inalienable right of consumer desire will soon produce what even cautious critics call “a social transformation” at the level of the individual body, as consumers purchase genetic enhance- ments (to take one example). In other words, steroids, cloning, gene mapping, and surgical implants are just the tip of an iceberg that, when it melts, will rebaptize human beings as cyborgs.5 William J. Mitchell calls this new self-concept “Me++”—a pun on the computer language C++—and claims this future is already present. When Mitchell claims to “routinely exist in the condition . . . [of] ‘man-computer symbiosis,’” or that he “now interact[s] with sensate, intelligent, intercon- nected devices scattered throughout my environment,” who can argue with him? An eminent design theorist and urban planner at MIT, Mitchell breezily describes a near future of “high-tech ‘wearables’” with implanted computers (e.g., clothes, eyeglasses, shoes) that extend our sense of self over an increasingly permeable body surface. If each person is “jacked in” to dozens of computers within a “few millimeters” of the human shell, will that transform human nature (as many GNR enthusiasts claim)? As Mitchell declares, “increasingly I just don’t think of this as computer interaction,” but as something like an expansive self. “Me++” is a consumer gold rush: the evolution of the fragile human body into a silicon-based cyborg with superhuman capacities. Here’s a complementary—and unexceptional—claim from Rodney A. Brooks, the chair of the Artificial Intelligence Lab at MIT: “We are about to become our machines . . . [we] will morph into machines.” Brooks admits this process may bring short-term metaphysical confusion, but he assures readers in Flesh and Machines: How Robots Will Change Us that GNR technologies will bring long-term progress.6 What do claims for “man-computer symbiosis” have to do with whiteness and religion? Brooks and Mitchell are technological determinists for whom the blithe morphing of the human organism into cyborgs recapitulates the Western tendency to **universalize its own perspective**. Their works consider the coming of GNR technologies as inevitable, progressive, and beneficial, and their rhetoric assumes universal, equitable distribution of such changes. Moreover, their disregard of social realities **perpetuates a**n unspoken **racialized** (white) **narrative of exclusion** that treats technology as an “autonomous” aspect of cultural production illuminating the road to a utopian future that will not require social or political change.7 Technological progress has long **structured Euro-American identity**, and it functions as a prop for a muted form of social Darwinism—either “might makes right,” or “survival of the fittest.” Here is the techno-cultural matrix: progress, religion, whiteness, modernity, masculinity, the future. This matrix **reproduces an assumed superiority** over societies perceived as static, primitive, passive, Communist, terrorist, or fundamentalist (depending on the era). The historian of technology Carroll Pursell points out that “the most significant engine and marker” of modernity is “technology ([which is] almost always seen as masculine in our society),” and that only the West invokes modernity as “a signal characteristic of its self-definition.”8 In Machines as the Measure of Man: Science, Technology, and Ideologies of Western Dominance, Michael Adas traced the rhetoric of technology as it became the primary measure of intelligence, ra- tionality, and the good society, supplanting Christianity for nineteenth-century colonial powers. Weapons, mass production, and communication networks became **the fetishes of colonial dominance and racial superiority**, which were disseminated (for example) in numerous British best sellers through binary opposites of dominance/passivity: “machine versus human or animal power; science versus superstition and myth; synthetic versus organic; progressive versus stagnant.”9 Such oppositions still inform contemporary theories of Western superiority (e.g., “the clash of civilizations,” “the end of history”). Casting preindustrial (or premodern) peoples as risk-averse and enslaved to obsolescent ideologies—that is, as not progressing—sentences them to second-class status with regard to the future.

### 1nc science

#### Science is imperialism

**Hamm 5**, - (Bernd, Professor of Sociology, Jean Monnet Professor of European Studies, UNESCO Chair in Europe in a Global Perspective at the University of Trier, Germany, “Cynical Science: Science and Truth as Cultural Imperialism,” cut from Cultural Imperialism: Essays on the Political Economy of Cultural Domination, google books)//A-Berg

This chapter argues that our Western concepts of science and truth are used to legitimate interests aimed at the **suppression and exploitation** of nature and humans. They are used to mask the destructive character of Western political-economic interests. In doing this, science and truth have become ideologies. As such, they tend to benefit the “Power Elites” (C.W. Mills 1956)’ of society and, of course, the scientific community, at the cost of the population at large. The forced global imposition of this under standing of science and truth is part of cultural imperialism. This thesis is formulated in negative terms. It criticizes Western science but will not propose alternatives. Theodor W. Adorno, one of the leading figures of the Frankfurt School of sociology, has coined the term “negative dialectics” and argued that a critical analysis of existing reality implicitly contains its antithesis. This is not the place to go deeper into the issue of other knowledge systems (for a discussion of this see, e.g., Goonatilake ij8). My intention is not to follow up on Johan GaIning’s (1971) understanding of scientific imperialism (as a subtype of cultural imperialism), which still holds the assumption that science is a serious attempt to find out “the truth” (the imperialism in it being, rather, that valid objective science exists but is misused in the interest of power), but rather to challenge this assumption. Science has become in the course of history, or always was, so closely associated with, and subservient to the interests of, the power cadres that the idealistic idea of science appears as a major instrument to safeguard access to and influence on these cadres; in other words, it is a professional ideology The chapter will explore this thesis, first, by recapitulating the Western definition of science and truth as objective and value-free. It then moves on to some observations which do not comply with this self-image: the relation between science, money, and power; science and the problem of sustainable development; the Americanization of science; and university reform as experienced In Germany as part of the Bologna Process. These observations contrasted with the ideology will lead to a diagnosis of cynical science. Finally the globalization of such cynicism will be discussed. The Ideology of Science and Truth “Knowledge” may be defined as the way in which humans categorize, encode process, and impute meaning to their experiences. This is as true of scientific as of non-scientific forms of knowledge (Studley 1998:1). There are many different ways to acquire knowledge: through logical reasoning; sensual perception; intuition; authority and conformism; or devotion and love. An experience made according to certain rules commonly accepted in the community of scientists is called “scientific.” Irrelevant as this code might be for the majority of ordinary people, it has still succeeded in gaining strategic influence among cadres. Knowledge is acquired and processed in the context of world views, of systems of knowledge, and of cultures which people share and regularly confirm to each other. It is built into existing frames of reference, evaluated, and selected; meaning is attached to it and tied into the historical experience of a given society. It is neither autonomous nor objective but rather bound into those social conditions under which people live and is influenced by the social position of an individual in his or her society and the respective material living conditions. The sociology of knowledge (beginning with Karl Mannheim, 1893-1947) has provided ample evidence for this (see, however, the critical review of Mannheim’s approach by Adorno 1955), and many empirical studies have explored the images of society held by different social strata and professional groups. Such paradigms, which are relatively resistant to change, also exist in science, as Thomas Kuhn (1962) has argued. In everyday life, we accept a statement as “true” if it is confirmed by the rules of everyday experience, if it seems reasonable, if it is held true by people we love and respect, or ¡fit is confirmed by secondary information. A statement is taken to be “scientifically true” if it has been published in a highly reputable volume and is taken for granted by respected scientists, or 1f It has been tested according to the mies of scientific methodology. Karl Popper’s insistence that the truth of a statement can never be objectively confirmed in scientific rigour and that the scientific method demands that well-established hypotheses be falsified, thus gradually narrowing the field of potential truth, Is of only theoretical value (Popper 1960). It does not count very much In real practical research because new hypotheses are being continuously generated and tested in the hope of verification, while sets of well-established hypotheses being falsified is the exception. In extra-scientific everyday life, sensual experience, the opinion of a reference group, but mostly the mass media are relevant proofs of truth. In most of the sciences the empirical proof of truth is made by statistical tests based on probability theory, while quoting from the Bible or from a classical author has lost its persuasiveness. Mathematics is seen as an objective basis for rational argument. Empirical phenomena are supposed to be translated into the language of numbers to become scientifically accessible by mathematical transformation. Truth can be calculated, according to common belief in the scientific community The methods of scientific discovery are conventional; they rest on culturally specific consensus. However, we also have to assume that there are different ways towards achieving knowledge, which might well lead to differ ent results. Scientific education and training transfer such conventions. Therefore, it is important to understand who is entitled to determine the existence of such conventions, and on which criteria. Despite the obvious need for such careful reflection, the current common practice is that European (and other) social scientists tend to accept those statistical and methodological procedures which are the fashion of the day in the US as the standard for the relevance of our own work. The way into “refereed journals” seems to be more often paved with sophisticated statistics than with theoretically relevant arguments. How often do we find heavy statistical artillery used to shoot at theoretical mice! According to its self-image, science has to be independent and valuefree, leaving the scientist devoid of all external restrictions. There is only one goal, i.e., pure, purposeless knowledge. No political, economic, or other non-scientific interest should intrude into and divert the scientific process. Only then is it guaranteed that science will come continuously closer to the truth. Curiosity is not only part of the inner nature of humans but also serves the benefit of humankind at large. The scientist has one and only one task: to engage in pure research and make his or her knowledge available to others. He or she bears no responsibility beyond this. This is why the nationstate maintains universities and guarantees the freedom of research and teaching (sometimes, like in Germany, even in the constitution). National governments are well advised to invest in science because, at least in the long run, science will lead to wisdom and betterment, but also to competitive advantages, and thus to innovation, growth, employment, and income. Globalization increases the validity and the relevance of this argument. It is true, there are problems. Education, science, innovation, and growth are believed to be the means to solve them. According to this logic, many problems have their cause in the fact that people are not scientifically educated, that they act in their traditional, “irrational” ways. Scientific progress is seen as the solution for all our problems: diseases will be eradicated or healed, environmental damages prevented or repaired, poverty and hunger overcome, non-renewable resources substituted, crime and drug abuse prevented, life-time extended and eternal youth achieved, development enforced and material welfare secured for all. Scientific progress is the panacea for all deficits. The idea of a reality that opens itself to scientifically objective insight— that problems are the simple consequence of insufficient knowledge—is very tempting. First, it provides a welcome excuse because nobody is responsible for the deficits in scientific knowledge. Secondly, it allows us to delegate the solution of our problems to others. The competence to establish the objective truth has been attributed to science. The reputation of science depends largely on its ability to render this service to society Of course, this image of science has always been put to doubt. There have always been, in all disciplines, individual voices calling for an ethical foundation for science. Often these ethical scientists have been criticized by the mainstream, who argue that they oppose intellectual freedom and the freedom of research and, hence, that they are against democratic thinking and might even advocate state-directed science. This would, of course, ultimately serve the interests of the ruling class—ironically making scientists with a strong ethical foundation alleged proponents of political totalitarianism. To avoid overgeneralization, it needs to be noted that “Western or “modem” science is by no means a homogeneous body There are “intellectual styles” (Gakung 1988: ) in different societies, and there have always been dissenting voices among the disciplinary mainstreams, marginal epistemological positions with greater or smaller numbers of proponents. The characteristics described above refer to the mainstream. Value freedom, purposelessness, and non-responsibility are seen as primary virtues in those very institutions that serve the self-administration of science and receive gigantic sums of money for research funding. They still provide the yardsticks for academic education and are being used to justify the privileges which scientists enjoy in our societies, especially in the rank of professors. In an article on “Western Domination in Knowledge,”1 the Sri Lankan writer Nalin de Silva (2002) addressed this problem very directly, arguing that: “Western science is supposed to be making attempts to understand the objective reality, and the truths or whatever that is taught by the westerners is said to be objectively valid. The entire European modernism that began in the fifteenth century with Renaissance, is based on objectivity, reality, and absolute truth.” Science, then, is the process of the gradual and methodologically standardized approximation of objective reality However, to be in a position to assess the degree of approximation, we should already know the objective truth. This is, in other words, a classical circular argument. Even if we assume, continues de Silva, that there is an objective reality that we can apprehend and can appropriate (“know”), even then the process of appropriation is subjective, or relative. There is no way to appropriate an objective reality objectively, ne., equally valid for all at the same time. Even the concept of objective reality is formulated subjectively (a very similar argument has been advanced by Feyerabend 1979).

### catastrophe

#### This discourages individual actions to solve warming and makes us more vulnerable to authoritarianism

**Buell, 3** Professor of English at Cornell 2003 (Frederick, From Apocalypse to Way of Life) Looked at critically, then, crisis discourse thus suffers from a number of liabilities. First, it seems to have become a political liability almost as much as an asset. It calls up a fierce and effective opposition with its predictions; worse, its more specific predictions are all too vulnerable to refutation by events. It also exposes environmentalists to being called grim doomsters and antilife Puritan extremists. Further, concern with crisis has all too often tempted people to try to find a “total solution” to the problems involved— a phrase that, as an astute analyst of the limitations of crisis discourse, John Barry, puts it, is all too reminiscent of the Third Reich’s infamous “final solution.”55 A total crisis of society—**environmental crisis at its gravest—threatens to translate despair into inhumanist authoritarianism**; more often, however, it helps keep merely dysfunctional authority in place. It thus leads, Barry suggests, to the belief that only elite- and expert-led solutions are possible.56 At the same time it depoliticizes people, inducing them to accept their impotence as individuals; this is something that **has made many people today feel**, ironically and/or passively, **that since it makes no difference at all what any individual does on his or her own, one might as well go along with it.** Yet another pitfall for the full and sustained elaboration of environmental crisis is, though least discussed, perhaps the most deeply ironic. A problem with deep cultural and psychological as well as social effects, it is embodied in a startlingly simple proposition: the worse one feels environmental crisis is, the more one is tempted to turn one’s back on the environment. This means, preeminently, turning one’s back on “nature”—on traditions of nature feeling, traditions of knowledge about nature (ones that range from organic farming techniques to the different departments of ecological science), and traditions of nature-based activism. **If nature is thoroughly wrecked these days, people need to delink from nature and live in postnature**—a conclusion that, as the next chapter shows, many in U.S. society drew at the end of the millenium. Explorations of how deeply “nature” has been wounded and how intensely vulnerable to and dependent on human actions it is can thus lead, ironically, to further indifference to nature-based environmental issues, not greater concern with them.

#### This causes extinction and turns case.

**Foucault** 19**78** (Michel Foucault, Professor of the History of Systems of Thought at the Collège de France, 1978, The History of Sexuality Volume 1: An Introduction, translated by Robert Hurley, p. 135-137, MT)

Since the classical age the West has undergone a very profound transformation of these mechanisms of power. "Deduction " has tended to be no longer the major form of power but merely one element among others, working to incite, reinforce, control, monitor, optimize, and organize the forces under it: a power bent on generating forces, making them grow, and ordering them, rather than one dedicated to impeding them, making them submit, or destroying them. There has been a parallel shift in the right of death, or at least a tendency to align itself with the exigencies of a life-administering power and to define itself accordingly. This death that was based on the right of the sovereign is now manifested as simply the reversal of the right of the social body to ensure, maintain, or develop its life. Yet wars were never as bloody as they have been since the nineteenth century, and all things being equal, never before did regimes visit such holocausts on their own populations. But **this formidable power of death**--and this is perhaps what accounts for part of its force and the cynicism with which it has so greatly expanded its limits--**now presents itself as the counterpart of a power that exerts a positive influence on life, that endeavors to administer, optimize, and multiply it, subjecting it to precise controls and comprehensive regulations.** Wars are no longer waged in the name of a sovereign who must be defended; they are waged on behalf of the existence of everyone; **entire populations are mobilized for the purpose of wholesale slaughter in the name of life necessity**: massacres have become vital. **It is as managers of life and survival, of bodies and the race, that so many regimes have been able to wage so many wars, causing so many [people] to be killed**. And through a turn that closes the circle, as the technology of wars has caused them to tend increasingly toward all-out destruction, the decision that initiated them and the one that terminates them are in fact increasingly informed by the naked question of survival. **The atomic situation is now at the end point of this process: the power to expose a whole population to death is the underside of the power to guarantee an individual's continued existence.** The principle underlying the tactics of battle--that one has to be capable of killing in order to go on living--has become the principle that defines the strategy of states. But the existence in question is no longer the judicial existence of sovereignty; **at stake is the biological existence of a population.** If genocide is indeed the dream of modern powers, this is not because of a recent return of the ancient right to kill; it is because power is situated and exercised at the level of life, the species, the race, and the large-scale phenomena of population.

#### We aren’t disagreeing with what they do but how they do it --- the alternative is a prior question to development because it begs the question of our cultural orientation.

**Kimmins, 1** – (James Peter, Chairperson of the COMEST Sub-Commission on the Ethics of Energy, “The Ethics of Energy: A Framework for Action,” http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001235/123511eo.pdf)//HO

For most people in Western society, especially for policy-makers, ¶ science and technology offer **the only hope for solving environmental ¶ problems**, which often involve very technical matters. As science ¶ normally provides objective and factual answers in an area dominated ¶ by diverse interests, it seems an obvious avenue to turn to. However, ¶ environmental challenges are neither exclusively nor primarily problems ¶ in the realm of science and technology. They raise basic issues about ¶ human values and goals, and require answers to questions that are ¶ essentially **ethical and philosophical**. Many environmental scientists are convinced that solutions are to be ¶ found in the application of more environmentally sensitive technologies. ¶ But it is also quite clear that this **will not be enough** on its own if a stricter regulation of population size - mostly in developing regions - and ¶ especially a very **different behaviour** towards **energy demands** on the ¶ part of **affluent societies is not exercised**. The latter means, in many ¶ cases, a serious change in the levels of comfort enjoyed, as well as ¶ more sober expectations of the future standards of well-being sought by ¶ developing nations. These two issues represent fundamental ethical ¶ choices. ¶ In consequence, it makes **little sense** merely to look at how ¶ **developing countries** must transform their technologies and sources of ¶ energy for the future (which they obviously should do) as a way of ¶ solving the environmental problems we are facing globally. It makes ¶ even less sense to discuss how they will have to draw limits to their ¶ needs and expectations in isolation of what is, or should be, occurring in ¶ the rest of the world. ¶ Ethics play an important role in issues of development for the future by ¶ clarifying values at stake in policy decisions and giving moral reasons for ¶ alternative courses of action. Environmental and development questions ¶ are loaded with **moral implications** that need to be **understood** and **¶ carefully weighed** before intelligent choices are made. This should help ¶ resolve value conflicts that thwart ecological conservation and ¶ development projects. With the help of ethics, a **new social paradigm** ¶ should evolve that would promote sustainable development with the ¶ maintenance of cultural diversity, social justice and equity.

**And, their knowledge claims implicate their whole 1AC**

**Mignolo 9** – William H. Wannamaker Professor of Romance Studies and Literature at Duke University and Director of the Center for Global Studies and the Humanities, (Walter D., Epistemic Disobedience, Independent Thought and Decolonial Freedom, Theory Culture Society, 2009 26: 159 – 182, SAGE)//A-Berg

In what follows I revisit the formal apparatus of enunciation from the perspective of geo- and bio-graphic politics of knowledge. My revisiting is epistemic rather than linguistic, although focusing on the enunciation is unavoidable if we aim at changing the terms and not only the content of the conversation. The basic assumption is that **the knower is always implicated**, geo- and body-politically, **in the known**, although modern epistemology (e.g. the hubris of the zero point) managed to conceal both and created the figure of the detached observer, a neutral seeker of truth and objectivity who at the same time controls the disciplinary rules and puts himself or herself in a privileged position to evaluate and dictate.

## 1nr

#### reflects consensus of the lit.

**Mastanduno, 1** – professor of Government at Dartmouth College (Michael, “Economic Engagement Strategies: Theory and Practice” [http://web.archive.org/web/20120906033646/http://polisci.osu.edu/faculty/bpollins/book/Mastanduno.pdf](http://web.archive.org/web/20120906033646/http%3A/polisci.osu.edu/faculty/bpollins/book/Mastanduno.pdf)

An examination of the scholarly literature on economic engagement as an instrument of statecraft reveals a striking pattern. Albert Hirschman’s 1945 study, National Power and the Structure of Foreign Trade, is widely acknowledged today as a starting point for analysis (Hirschman, 1945/1980). Hirschman argued that the conscious cultivation of asymmetrical interdependence, if conducted strategically by the government of a powerful state, would lead weaker states to reorient not only their economies but also their foreign policies to the preferences of the stronger state. He developed a systematic framework for analysis and applied it to the trading and political relationships between

#### Allowing effects topicality is a limits disaster on this topic – everything the US does effects the international economy

**Derrick, 98** - LIEUTENANT COLONEL ROBERT R. DERRICK United States Army (“ENGAGEMENT: THE NATIONS PREMIER GRAND STRATEGY, WHO'S IN CHARGE?” <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA342695>)

In addition to the agencies that administer the programs listed in figure 3, the State Department proclaims that "...protecting national interests and advancing US goals involve virtually every agency of the government...."16 US governmental agencies with international reach directly engage as a part of their daily routines. Agencies that deal strictly with domestic policy indirectly engage through the effect their actions have on US markets and thus world markets. For example the Departments of State, Defense, Agriculture, Transportation, and Energy, have both domestic and international responsibilities. From trade status to travel status, from immigration rules to export of tools, from training flights to basing rights, US agencies directly and indirectly engage through hundreds of programs. US governmental agencies that inadvertently operate at crosspurposes, through misunderstanding or ignorance, must ultimately be coordinated at some point. Since there is no single director below the President to coordinate the US engagement activities of the three elements of national power, it becomes the responsibility of the regional CINCs and Ambassadors.

#### They are mixing burdens --- trade expansion has to be the action of the plan, not the result of the plan

**Celik, 11 –** master’s student at Uppsala University (Department of Peace and Conflict Research) (Arda, Economic Sanctions and Engagement Policies <http://www.grin.com/en/e-book/175204/economic-sanctions-and-engagement-policies>)

Economic engagement policies are strategic integration behaviour which involves with the target state. Engagement policies differ from other tools in Economic Diplomacy. They target to deepen the economic relations to create economic intersection, interconnectness, and mutual dependence and finally seeks economic interdependence. This interdependence serves the sender state to change the political behaviour of target state. However they cannot be counted as carrots or inducement tools, they focus on long term strategic goals and they are not restricted with short term policy changes.(Kahler&Kastner,2006) They can be unconditional and focus on creating greater economic benefits for both parties. Economic engagement targets to seek deeper economic linkages via promoting institutionalized mutual trade thus mentioned interdependence creates two major concepts. Firstly it builds strong trade partnership to avoid possible militarized and non militarized conflicts. Secondly it gives a leeway to perceive the international political atmosphere from the same and harmonized perspective. Kahler and Kastner define the engagement policies as follows, “It is a policy of deliberate expanding economic ties with and adversary in order to change the behaviour of target state and improve bilateral relations”.(p523-abstact).It is an intentional economic strategy that expects bigger benefits such as long term economic gains and more importantly; political gains. The main idea behind the engagement motivation is stated by Rosecrance (1977) in a way that “the direct and positive linkage of interests of states where a change in the position of one state affects the position of others in the same direction.”

#### Definitely control predictability --- conesus of lit is SO far on our side it’s an easy neg ballot

**Sheen, 2** – associate professor at the Graduate School of International Studies, Seoul National University (Seongho, The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis, Vol. XIV, No. 1, Spring 2002, “US Strategy of Engagement During the Cold War and Its Implication for Sunshine Policy” <http://www.kida.re.kr/data/2006/04/14/seongho_sheen.pdf>) footnote 22

22 Speaking of different strategies of economic statecraft, Michael Mastanduno distinguishes: “Whereas economic warfare and a strategic embargo aim to weaken the capabilities (economic and/or military) of a target state and rely on either comprehensive or selective trade denial, linkage strategies are characterized by a reliance on some degree of trade expansion as a means to influence the behavior or policies of a target government.” In particular, he calls the unconditional positive engagement policy as a “structural linkage” strategy. Michael Mastanduno, Economic Containment: CoCom and the Politics of East-West Trade (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992), pp. 53–58.

#### This means trade has to be the mechanism of the plan – engagement is a deliberate expansion of economic ties, not an effect

**KARAKASIS, 8** – MA in INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS at Instabul Bilgi University (VASILEIOS, “THE IMPACT OF EUROPEANIZATION ON GREECE’S ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY TOWARDS TURKEY”, <http://www.academia.edu/667112/The_Impact_of_Europeanization_on_Greeces_Engagement_Strategy_towards_Turkey>)

This policy is accompanied by an economic pillar. By economic engagement what can be implied is a policy of deliberately expanding economic ties with the adversary aiming to change its attitude and improve the bilateral relations. This pillar relies on increasing levels of trade and investments aiming to moderate the target’s interests’ conceptions by shifting incentives and building networks of interdependence.48 Economic interdependence is able to operate as transforming agent that reshapes the goals of the latter. It can generate and establish vested interests in the context of target society and government undermining old values of military status and territorial acquisition. The beneficiaries of this interdependence become addicted to it and protect their interests by putting pressure on the government to accommodate the source of independence.49 Internationalist elites committed to economic openness and international stability might marginalize nationalist elites which are wedded to the threat or use of force. Regardless whether the society of targeted society constitutes a pluralist democracy or not, interests tied to international economy become a critical part of the electorate to whom political elites must respond.50