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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 resistance**for 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 resistance**have 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, **connecting**what 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 role**in 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 spheres**protecting 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 s**tudents 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.

### 1nc da

**Prices rising now --- will remain above $100 --- best and most predictive evidence**

**AllAfrica News 7-30** (“High Oil Prices - Boom to Some, Doom to Others”, 2013, http://m.allafrica.com/stories/201307301218.html/, Deech)

Oil prices have remained **consistently high** and volatile over the past few years. According to estimates, they may remain this way at least until 2014. The Brent crude spot price, which averaged 112 dollars a barrel in 2012, is **projected** to remain **above 100 dollars** a barrel. This is at an average of 108 dollars and 101 dollars per barrel, in 2013 and 2014, respectively. High oil prices may dampen the global economy, which is still struggling to recover from the 2008 financial crisis. High oil prices above 100 dollars can be explained by many factors and they may affect economies in an uneven way, with an unclear outcome for the global economy as a whole. According to estimates by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), a 50pc increase in oil prices, due to a supply shock, would lead to a one to 1.5pc decrease in output, in many regions of the world. Rising oil prices will affect African economies differently depending on whether they are net exporters or net importers of the commodity. For oil-importing economies, high oil prices could translate into high import bills with adverse effects on inflation, production and employment. In contrast, oil-exporting economies could benefit from high oil prices, because an increase in oil revenues improves their balance of payments. In addition, price volatility may harm both importers and exporters of oil. It lowers, for instance, the predictability of marginal costs of production for companies. The uncertainty regarding their cash flows may induce companies to reduce their investments and limit job creation, which can consequently harm economic growth. Oil prices have increased since 2003, from less than 40 dollars to more than 100 dollars per barrel today. Oil prices fell sharply in 2008, before recovering steadily since then. Prices were volatile during 2011 and 2012, mainly because of the Arab Spring and events in Libya, in addition to conflict between Sudan and South Sudan. Many uncertain and conflicting factors on both supply and demand sides have contributed to the persistent high oil prices in recent years. Geopolitical factors are the main causes that drove up oil prices in producing countries. In the past decade, wars in Iraq and political tensions in the Middle East and North Africa have affected the oil market. More recently, disagreements between Western nations and Iran - one of the largest oil producers and exporters in the world - have fuelled risks of sharp disruptions in oil supplies globally. This, in turn, had a significant impact on prices of the commodity. In contrast, major oil producing countries, mainly Saudi Arabia, may not be able to boost production and instead have to cover losses elsewhere, as their capacities are reaching their limit. The decline in aggregate oil inventories and high costs of oil extraction and production are other supply-side factors affecting oil prices. Increasing demand from major emerging economies, such as China and India, has also played an important role in keeping oil prices **persistently high** over the past years. The Asian continent surpassed the US and is now the largest consumer of oil in the world. Despite the slowdown in economic growth in China and India, demand will **remain higher**. This will keep oil prices at high levels. Furthermore, as growth is resuming in the US and as the crisis in the euro area seems to be easing, global demand for oil may increase.

**The plan triggers an OPEC flood --- even if they don’t displace the transportation sector --- drops the price below $100**

**Schelmetic 11** (Tracey E., Contributor – TMC, “Saudi Prince Frets that High Oil Prices will Spur Drive to Alternative Energy”, TMC, 6-1, http://green.tmcnet.com/channels/renewable-energy/articles/181084-saudi-prince-frets-that-high-oil-prices-will.htm, Deech)

What do you do when you're a theocratic ruler of an oil-rich nation and you see the insidious creep of **alternative energy** technologies coming to end your party? You worry, apparently. Saudi Arabian prince Alwaleed bin Talal recently told CNN that his country wants to see oil prices **come down** to between **$70** and $80 a barrel. The reason? The Saudi rulers are **apprehensive** that high oil prices are spurring Western countries to seek replacement energy sources. The prince is concerned that if oil prices remain at high current levels, countries that use a lot of petroleum products – like the U.S. and Western European nations – will be encouraged to invest in alternative energy sources such as **solar**, **wind power**, **geothermal heat**, **hydropower** and **other technologies** – all of which would be **detrimental** to the oil-rich nation.

**Any sustained drop below $100 per barrel causes Russian collapse --- that’s the key benchmark**

**Whitmore 13** (Brian, Senior Russia Correspondent – Radio Free Europe, “After The Storm: Trends To Watch In Russia In 2013”, Radio Free Europe, 1-2, The Power Vertical)

It began with a roar and it ended with a whimper. As 2012 wound down in Russia, the soaring expectations for change that accompanied the civic awakening and mass protests at the year’s dawn had clearly faded. But the social, economic, and political forces that spawned them will continue to shape the landscape well into the new year. A fledgling middle class remains hungry for political change, splits still plague the ruling elite over the way forward, and a fractious opposition movement continues to struggle to find its voice. With the Kremlin unable to decisively squelch the mounting dissent and the opposition unable to topple President Vladimir Putin, Russia has entered an uneasy **holding pattern** that has the feel of an interlude between two epochs. "I don't think we are at the end of the Putin era, but we are at the beginning of the end," says longtime Russia-watcher Edward Lucas, international editor of the British weekly "The Economist" and author of the recently published book "Deception." With economic headwinds on the horizon, generational conflict brewing, and new political forces developing, Russian society is changing -- and changing rapidly. But the political system remains **ossified**. So what can we expect in 2013? Below are several trends and issues to keep an eye on in the coming year. The Oil Curse: Energy Prices And The Creaking Welfare State If 2012 was all about politics, 2013 will also be about **economics**. The Russian economy, the cliche goes, **rests on** two pillars -- oil and gas. And both will come under increasing pressure as the year unfolds. World oil prices, currently hovering between $90 and **$100 per barrel**, are expected to be volatile for the foreseeable future. And any sharp drop could prove **catastrophic** for the Russian economy. Energy experts and economists say Russia's budget will **only** stay balanced if oil prices remain **between $100 and $110** per barrel. Five years ago, the figure needed for a balanced budget was $50 to $55.

**The impact is extinction.**

**Filger 9** (Sheldon, Author – Huffington Post, “Russian Economy Faces Disastrous Free Fall Contraction”, http://www.globaleconomiccrisis.com/blog/archives/356)

**In Russia**, historically, **economic** health **and** political **stability are intertwined** to a degree that is rarely encountered in other major industrialized economies. It was the economic stagnation of the former Soviet Union that led to its political downfall. Similarly, Medvedev and Putin, both intimately acquainted with their nation's history, are unquestionably alarmed at the prospect that Russia's economic crisis will endanger the nation's political stability, achieved at great cost after years of chaos following the demise of the Soviet Union. Already, strikes and protests are occurring among rank and file workers facing unemployment or non-payment of their salaries. Recent polling demonstrates that the once supreme popularity ratings of Putin and Medvedev are eroding rapidly. Beyond the political elites are the financial oligarchs, who have been forced to deleverage, even unloading their yachts and executive jets in a desperate attempt to raise cash. Should the Russian economy deteriorate to the point where economic collapse is not out of the question, the impact will go far beyond the obvious accelerant such an outcome would be for the Global Economic Crisis. There is a geopolitical dimension that is even more relevant then the economic context. Despite its economic vulnerabilities and perceived decline from superpower status, Russia remains one of only two nations on earth with a nuclear arsenal of sufficient scope and capability to destroy the world as we know it. For that reason, it is not only President Medvedev and Prime Minister Putin who will be lying awake at nights over the prospect that a national economic crisis can transform itself into a virulent and destabilizing social and political upheaval. It just may be possible that U.S. President Barack Obama's national security team has already briefed him about the consequences of a major economic meltdown in Russia for the peace of the world. After all, the most recent national intelligence estimates put out by the U.S. intelligence community have already concluded that the Global Economic Crisis represents the greatest national security threat to the United States, due to its facilitating political instability in the world. During the years Boris Yeltsin ruled Russia, security forces responsible for guarding the nation's nuclear arsenal went without pay for months at a time, leading to fears that **desperate personnel would** illicitly **sell nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations**. If the current economic crisis in Russia were to deteriorate much further, how secure would the Russian nuclear arsenal remain? It may be that the financial impact of the Global Economic Crisis is its least dangerous consequence.

### 1nc 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

## relations

#### No impact to bioterrorism.

**Mueller 10** [John, Woody Hayes Chair of National Security Studies at the Mershon Center for International Security Studies and a Professor of Political Science at The Ohio State University, A.B. from the University of Chicago, M.A. and Ph.D. @ UCLA, Atomic Obsession – Nuclear Alarmism from Hiroshima to Al-Qaeda, Oxford University Press]

Properly developed and deployed, biological weapons could potentially, if thus far only in theory, kill hundreds of thousands, perhaps even millions, of people. The discussion remains theoretical because biological weapons have scarcely ever been used. For the most destructive results, they need to be dispersed in very low-altitude aerosol clouds. Since aerosols do not appreciably settle, pathogens like anthrax (which is not easy to spread or catch and is not contagious) would probably have to be sprayed near nose level. Moreover, 90 percent of the microorganisms are likely to die during the process of aerosolization, while their effectiveness could be reduced still further by sunlight, smog, humidity, and temperature changes. Explosive methods of dispersion may destroy the organisms, and, except for anthrax spores, long-term storage of lethal organisms in bombs or warheads is difficult: even if refrigerated, most of the organisms have a limited lifetime. Such weapons can take days or weeks to have full effect, during which time they can be countered with medical and civil defense measures. In the summary judgment of two careful analysts, delivering microbes and toxins over a wide area in the form most suitable for inflicting mass casualties-as an aerosol that could be inhaled-requires a delivery system of enormous sophistication, and even then effective dispersal could easily be disrupted by unfavorable environmental and meteorological conditions.

#### 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.

#### Can’t deter conflict – evolutionary psychology.

**Thayer** **‘07** [Bradley A., Professor in the Department of Defense and Strategic Studies, Missouri State University, July, “Thinking about Nuclear Deterrence Theory: Why Evolutionary Psychology Undermines Its Rational Actor Assumptions,” Comparative Strategy, Vol. 26, No. 4]

We have such a situation today, where great advances in the life sciences, particularly genetics and cognitive neuroscience, have made possible the rise of evolutionary psychology and the related fields of biological and cognitive psychology.2 Through their combined efforts, these sciences are revolutionizing our knowledge of the causes of human behavior at genetic and somatic levels. For the first time, we are able to perceive how the brain functions and to understand, in equal parts, what a wonderful and simultaneously imperfect organ it is. But few scholars in the social sciences notice.3 Most often, the difficulty in removing academic stovepipes is not an urgent matter, and those wishing change may take heart in Paul Samuelson's famous quip about theories advancing one funeral at a time. Nonetheless, there are rare instances where academic stovepiping is a critical and time urgent problem. The great progress in evolutionary psychology is such a problem because of its implications for deterrence theory. This brief article explains how evolutionary psychology undermines rational deterrence theory. My argument is important because the key assumption of rational deterrence theory, that nuclear decision makers will make rational decisions about nuclear use due to their fundamental rationality, is so influential. This belief is widely shared among governmental decision makers, the arms control community and major media, and in academic circles. And it is wrong. Evolutionary psychology is causing a revolution in our understanding of the human brain. Comprehending the human brain is now possible due to an understanding of genetics, neural processing, and technology like the functional MRI (fMRI), which allows scientists for the first time to be able to understand how the human brain functions by identifying brain regions with increased blood flow corresponding to increased neuronal activity, after a stimulus (such as the word “cat”) is provided to a patient. Much work remains to be done by evolutionary psychologists, but the results are already impressive. The data are troubling for any discipline or theory that assumes a rational actor. As a result of advances in evolutionary psychology, we now know that the human mind is heavily influenced by the environment and body. How the brain interprets actions and makes decisions is complicated, imperfect, greatly dependent upon emotions, and varied among humans. There is tremendous variation in the human brain, with the result that threats that work in most circumstances will not work in all and that the appreciation of consequences, upon which rational deterrence theorists depend, cannot be assumed. Accordingly, it is fundamentally naïve and dangerous to assume a similar outcome (e.g. that nuclear deterrence will obtain) in all situations when there is variation in people (e.g. leaders), even when the consequences are great, as it is when nuclear weapons are involved. This finding has enormous implications for nuclear deterrence theory: the rational deterrence model's assumption of a universal rationality in the face of a nuclear deterrent threat is irredeemably flawed.

## warming

#### No extinction

**Carter et. Al 11–** Robert, PhD, Adjuct Research Fellow, James Cook University, Craig Idso, PhD, Chairman at the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Fred Singer, PhD, President of the Science and Environmental Policy Project, Susan Crockford, evolutionary biologist with a specialty in skeletal taxonomy , paleozoology and vertebrate evolution, Joseph D’Aleo, 30 years of experience in professional meteorology, former college professor of Meteorology at Lyndon State College, Indur Goklany, independent scholar, author, and co-editor of the Electronic Journal of Sustainable Development, Sherwood Idso, President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Research Physicist with the US Department of Agriculture, Adjunct Professor in the Departments of Geology, Botany, and Microbiology at Arizona State University, Bachelor of Physics, Master of Science, and Doctor of Philosophy, all from the University of Minnesota, Madhav Khandekar, former research scientist from Environment Canada and is an expert reviewer for the IPCC 2007 Climate Change Panel, Anthony Lupo, Department Chair and Professor of Atmospheric Science at the University of Missouri, Willie Soon, astrophysicist at the Solar and Stellar Physics Division of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, Mitch Taylor (Canada) (March 8th, “[Surviving](../../../../Marc/Desktop/Surviving) the Unpreceented Climate Change of the IPCC” <http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/mar/8mar2011a5.html>) Jacome

On the other hand, they indicate that some biologists and climatologists have pointed out that "many of the predicted increases in climate have happened before, in terms of both magnitude and rate of change (e.g. Royer, 2008; Zachos *et al*., 2008), and yet biotic communities have remained remarkably resilient (Mayle and Power, 2008) and in some cases thrived (Svenning and Condit, 2008)." But they report that those who mention these things are often "placed in the 'climate-change denier' category," although the purpose for pointing out these facts is simply to present "a sound scientific basis for understanding biotic responses to the magnitudes and rates of climate change predicted for the future through using the vast data resource that we can exploit in fossil records." Going on to do just that, Willis *et al*. focus on "intervals in time in the fossil record when atmospheric CO2 concentrations increased up to 1200 ppm, temperatures in mid- to high-latitudes increased by greater than 4°C within 60 years, and sea levels rose by up to 3 m higher than present," describing studies of past biotic responses that indicate "the scale and impact of the magnitude and rate of such climate changes on biodiversity." And what emerges from those studies, as they describe it, "is evidence for rapid community turnover, migrations, development of novel ecosystems and thresholds from one stable ecosystem state to another." And, most importantly in this regard, they report "there is very little evidence for broad-scale extinctions due to a warming world." In concluding, the Norwegian, Swedish and UK researchers say that "based on such evidence we urge some caution in assuming broad-scale extinctions of species will occur due solely to climate changes of the magnitude and rate predicted for the next century," reiterating that "the fossil record indicates remarkable biotic resilience to wide amplitude fluctuations in climate.

#### Negative feedbacks prevent warming

**Evans 12** ­–consultant of the Australian Greenhouse Office/Department of Climate Change, main modeler of carbon in Australia’s biosphere 1999-2005, mathematician, engineer with 6 university degrees, Ph.D. from Stanford in electrical engineering (David. M. W., “The Skeptic’s Case”, 2/24/12; < https://mises.org/daily/5892/The-Skeptics-Case>)//Beddow

The serious skeptical scientists have always agreed with the government climate scientists about the direct effect of CO2. The argument is entirely about the feedbacks. The feedbacks dampen or reduce the direct effect of the extra CO2, cutting it roughly in half.[5] The main feedbacks involve evaporation, water vapor, and clouds. In particular, water vapor condenses into clouds, so extra water vapor due to the direct warming effect of extra CO2 will cause extra clouds, which reflect sunlight back out to space and cool the earth, thereby reducing the overall warming. There are literally thousands of feedbacks, each of which either reinforces or opposes the direct-warming effect of the extra CO2. Almost every long-lived system is governed by net feedback that dampens its response to a perturbation. If a system instead reacts to a perturbation by amplifying it, the system is likely to reach a tipping point and become unstable (like the electronic squeal that erupts when a microphone gets too close to its speakers). The earth's climate is long-lived and stable — it has never gone into runaway greenhouse, unlike Venus — which strongly suggests that the feedbacks dampen temperature perturbations such as that from extra CO2. The climate models have been essentially the same for 30 years now, maintaining roughly the same sensitivity to extra CO2 even while they got more detailed with more computer power. How well have the climate models predicted the temperature? Does the data better support the climate models or the skeptic's view? One of the earliest and most important predictions was presented to the US Congress in 1988 by Dr James Hansen, the "father of global warming": Hansen's climate model clearly exaggerated future temperature rises. In particular, his climate model predicted that if human CO2 emissions were cut back drastically starting in 1988, such that by year 2000 the CO2 level was not rising at all, we would get his scenario C. But in reality the temperature did not even rise this much, even though our CO2 emissions strongly increased — which suggests that the **climate models greatly overestimate the effect of CO2 emissions**. A more considered prediction by the climate models was made in 1990 in the IPCC's First Assessment Report:[8] It's 20 years now, and the average rate of increase in reality is below the lowest trend in the range predicted by the IPCC. Ocean Temperatures The oceans hold the vast bulk of the heat in the climate system. We've only been measuring ocean temperature properly since mid-2003, when the Argo system became operational.[9][10] In Argo, a buoy duck dives down to a depth of 2,000 meters, measures temperatures as it very slowly ascends, then radios the results back to headquarters via satellite. Over 3,000 Argo buoys constantly patrol all the oceans of the world. The ocean temperature has been basically flat since we started measuring it properly, and not warming as quickly as the climate models predict. The climate models predict a particular pattern of atmospheric warming during periods of global warming; the most prominent change they predict is a warming in the tropics about 10 km up, the "hotspot." The hotspot is the sign of the amplification in their theory (see figure 1). The theory says the hotspot is caused by extra evaporation, and by extra water vapor pushing the warmer, wetter lower troposphere up into volume previously occupied by cool dry air. The presence of a hotspot would indicate amplification is occurring, and vice versa. We have been measuring atmospheric temperatures with weather balloons since the 1960s. Millions of weather balloons have built up a good picture of atmospheric temperatures over the last few decades, including the warming period from the late 1970s to the late '90s. This important and pivotal data was not released publicly by the climate establishment until 2006, and then in an obscure place.[13] Here it is: In reality there was no hotspot, not even a small one. So in reality there is no amplification — the amplification shown in figure 1 does not exist.[16] The climate models predict that when the surface of the earth warms, less heat is radiated from the earth into space (on a weekly or monthly time scale). This is because, according to the theory, the warmer surface causes more evaporation and thus there is more heat-trapping water vapor. This is the heat-trapping mechanism that is responsible for the assumed amplification in figure 1. Satellites have been measuring the radiation emitted from the earth for the last two decades. A major study has linked the changes in temperature on the earth's surface with the changes in the outgoing radiation. Here are the results: This shows that in reality the earth gives off more heat when its surface is warmer. This is the opposite of what the climate models predict. This shows that the climate models trap heat too aggressively, and that their assumed amplification shown in figure 1 does not exist. **All the data here is impeccably sourced — satellites, Argo, and weather balloons.[**18] The air and ocean temperature data shows that the climate models overestimate temperature rises. The climate establishment suggest that cooling due to undetected aerosols might be responsible for the failure of the models to date, but this excuse is wearing thin — it continues not to warm as much as they said it would, or in the way they said it would. On the other hand, the rise in air temperature has been greater than the skeptics say could be due to CO2. The skeptic's excuse is that the rise is mainly due to other forces — and they point out that the world has been in a fairly steady warming trend of 0.5°C per century since 1680 (with alternating ~30 year periods of warming and mild cooling) where as the vast bulk of all human CO2 emissions have been after 1945. We've checked all the main predictions of the climate models against the best data: Test Climate Models Air temperatures from 1988 Overestimated rise, even if CO2 is drastically cut Air temperatures from 1990 Overestimated trend rise Ocean temperatures from 2003 Overestimated trend rise greatly Atmospheric hotspot Completely missing → no amplification Outgoing radiation Opposite to reality → no amplification The climate models get them all wrong. The missing hotspot and outgoing radiation data both, independently, prove that the amplification in the climate models is not present. Without the amplification, the climate model temperature predictions would be cut by at least two-thirds, which would explain why they overestimated the recent air and ocean temperature increases. Therefore, The climate models are fundamentally flawed. Their assumed threefold amplification by feedbacks does not in fact exist. The climate models overestimate temperature rises due to CO2 by at least a factor of three. The skeptical view is compatible with the data. The data presented here is impeccably sourced, very relevant, publicly available, and from our best instruments. Yet it never appears in the mainstream media — have you ever seen anything like any of the figures here in the mainstream media? That alone tells you that the "debate" is about politics and power, and not about science or truth. This is an unusual political issue, because there is a right and a wrong answer, and everyone will know which it is eventually. People are going ahead and emitting CO2 anyway, so we are doing the experiment: either the world heats up by several degrees by 2050 or so, or it doesn't. Notice that the skeptics agree with the government climate scientists about the direct effect of CO2; they just disagree about the feedbacks. The climate debate is all about the feedbacks; everything else is merely a sideshow. Yet hardly anyone knows that. The government climate scientists and the mainstream media have framed the debate in terms of the direct effect of CO2 and sideshows such as arctic ice, bad weather, or psychology. They almost never mention the feedbacks. Why is that? Who has the power to make that happen?

#### Ice age coming --- causes extinction and outweighs warming since we can adapt --- co2 solves

Marsh ‘8 (Gerald E. Marsh, Retired Physicist from the Argonne National Laboratory and a former consultant to the Department of Defense on strategic nuclear technology and policy in the Reagan, Bush, and Clinton Administration, “The Coming of a New Ice Age,” February 24, 2008, <http://www.winningreen.com/site/epage/59549_621.htm>)//a-berg

CHICAGO — Contrary to the conventional wisdom of the day, the real danger facing humanity is not global warming, but more likely the coming of a new Ice Age. What we live in now is known as an interglacial, a relatively brief period between long ice ages. Unfortunately for us, most interglacial periods last only about ten thousand years, and that is how long it has been since the last Ice Age ended. How much longer do we have before the ice begins to spread across the Earth’s surface? Less than a hundred years or several hundred? We simply don’t know. Even if all the temperature increase over the last century is attributable to human activities, the rise has been relatively modest one of a little over one degree Fahrenheit — an increase well within natural variations over the last few thousand years. While an enduring temperature rise of the same size over the next century would cause humanity to make some changes, it would undoubtedly be within our ability to adapt. Entering a new ice age, however, would be catastrophic for the continuation of modern civilization. One has only to look at maps showing the extent of the great ice sheets during the last Ice Age to understand what a return to ice age conditions would mean. Much of Europe and North-America were covered by thick ice, thousands of feet thick in many areas and the world as a whole was much colder. The last “little” Ice Age started as early as the 14th century when the Baltic Sea froze over followed by unseasonable cold, storms, and a rise in the level of the Caspian Sea. That was followed by the extinction of the Norse settlements in Greenland and the loss of grain cultivation in Iceland. Harvests were even severely reduced in Scandinavia And this was a mere foreshadowing of the miseries to come. By the mid-17th century, glaciers in the Swiss Alps advanced, wiping out farms and entire villages. In England, the River Thames froze during the winter, and in 1780, New York Harbor froze. Had this continued, history would have been very different. Luckily, the decrease in solar activity that caused the Little Ice Age ended and the result was the continued flowering of modern civilization. There were very few Ice Ages until about 2.75 million years ago when Earth’s climate entered an unusual period of instability. Starting about a million years ago cycles of ice ages lasting about 100,000 years, separated by relatively short interglacial periods, like the one we are now living in became the rule. Before the onset of the Ice Ages, and for most of the Earth’s history, it was far warmer than it is today. Indeed, the Sun has been getting brighter over the whole history of the Earth and large land plants have flourished. Both of these had the effect of dropping carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere to the lowest level in Earth’s long history. Five hundred million years ago, carbon dioxide concentrations were over 13 times current levels; and not until about 20 million years ago did carbon dioxide levels dropped to a little less than twice what they are today. It is possible that moderately increased carbon dioxide concentrations could extend the current interglacial period. But we have not reached the level required yet, nor do we know the optimum level to reach. So, rather than call for arbitrary limits on carbon dioxide emissions, perhaps the best thing the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the climatology community in general could do is spend their efforts on determining the optimal range of carbon dioxide needed to extend the current interglacial period indefinitely. NASA has predicted that the solar cycle peaking in 2022 could be one of the weakest in centuries and should cause a very significant cooling of Earth’s climate. Will this be the trigger that initiates a new Ice Age? We ought to carefully consider this possibility before we wipe out our current prosperity by spending trillions of dollars to combat a perceived global warming threat that may well prove to be only a will-o-the-wisp.

## energy

#### 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 predicted 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.

#### Funding for fusion is an alt cause to nuclear meltdowns

ASP 8/3 – The American Security Project is a bipartisan initiative to educate the American public about the changing nature of national security in the 21st century (“Nick Cunningham and Andrew Holland: Through Innovation and Investment, U.S. Can Lead in Next-Generation Energy,” http://americansecurityproject.org/featured-items/2012/nick-cunningham-and-andrew-holland-through-innovation-and-investment-u-s-can-lead-in-next-generation-energy/)

In a recent Op-ed for AOL Energy, ASP Policy Analyst Nick Cunningham and Senior Fellow Andrew Holland discuss the need for long-term investments in R&D to help develop next-generation energy technologies. The U.S. has a history of bringing revolutionary technologies from the lab to the commercial market. This can be done again, particularly with fusion energy, but Congress is considering drastic cuts to the science R&D budget. From the article: Consistent R&D support allowed new technologies to move through the stages of innovation – from basic and applied research, to prototyping, demonstration, commercialization, until they are finally market competitive. This process often takes decades, so returns are uncertain and dispersed, meanwhile, costs are certain, immediate, and focused, – so the private sector underinvests in R&D. Since the private market is not designed to address these problems, there is a clear role for smart government policy. However, right now America’s energy policy is hampered because politicians only plan around four-year cycles. While today’s energy policy debates in Congress focused on which tax credit will get a one year extension and which will not, we are missing opportunities to develop energy technologies for the next generation. Most troubling is a push by Congress and the Administration to cut the federal R&D budget, crippling investments in critical new technologies. The consequences of these cuts will be felt immediately – and will last for decades. One striking example is the proposed budget cuts for fusion energy. Research in fusion has been going on for decades, and significant progress has been made. By fusing together two hydrogen isotopes – deuterium and tritium – enormous amounts of energy can be produced. Since deuterium comes from ocean water, and tritium can be produced from lithium, fusion holds the promise of providing a nearly inexhaustible supply of energy. Even better, no pollutants or greenhouse gases are emitted, and there is no threat of a nuclear meltdown like there is with the nuclear fission reactors of today.
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#### 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.

#### **This means that if we win a link, they lose --- this is a pass/fail gateway issue about the knowledge produced by the 1AC --- imperialism promotes modes of communication that produce real-world violence --- debate is an academic institution that can serve as a vital democratic space to combat the militarization of knowledge and equip us with the tools to fight for equality --- but their scholarship negates the potential for debate to do anything meaningful --- that’s Giroux --- only we have uniqueness --- the academy is being militarized now but we can still fight --- only voting negative gives your ballot meaning.**

**Rorty is lols --- they are spectators thinking they are in control**

**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.

### at: policy k/t s extinction

#### Imperialism causes extinction --- US scenario planning is grounded in pursuing constructed threats --- causes error replication that culminates in eternal warfare.

**Engelhardt 12** (Tom, Fellow at the Nation Institute, “Overwrought empire: The discrediting of US military power,” 10/12 <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2012/10/20121010104331399712.html>)

And here's the odd thing: in a sense, little has changed since then and yet everything seems different. Think of it as the American imperial paradox: **everywhere** there are now "**threats"** against our well-being which seem to demand action and yet nowhere are there commensurate enemies to go with them. Everywhere the US military still reigns supreme by almost any measure you might care to apply; and yet - in case the paradox has escaped you **- nowhere can it achieve its goals, however modest**. At one level, the American situation should simply take your breath away. Never before in modern history had there been an arms race of only one or a great power confrontation of only one. And at least in military terms, just as the [neoconservatives imagined](http://www.tomdispatch.com/blog/175336/tomgram%3A_engelhardt%2C_war_is_a_drug/) in those early years of the 21st century, the US remains the "sole superpower" or even "hyperpower" of planet Earth. The planet's top gun And yet the more dominant the US military becomes in its ability to destroy and the more its forces are spread across the globe, the more the **defeats** and semi-defeats **pile up,** the more the **missteps and mistakes grow**, the more the strains show, the more [the suicides rise](http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2012-09-26/news/bs-md-army-suicides-2-20120926_1_suicide-rate-suicide-prevention-army), the more the nation's treasure [disappears](http://www.tomdispatch.com/blog/175545/hellman_kramer_war_pay) down a black hole - and in response to all of this, the more moves the Pentagon makes. A great power without a significant enemy? You might have to go back to the Roman Empire at its height or some Chinese dynasty in full flower to find anything like it. And yet Osama bin Laden is dead. Al-Qaeda is reportedly a shadow of its former self. The great regional threats of the moment, North Korea and Iran, are regimes held together by baling wire and the suffering of their populaces. The only incipient great power rival on the planet, China, has [just launched](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/26/world/asia/china-shows-off-an-aircraft-carrier-but-experts-are-skeptical.html) its first aircraft carrier, a refurbished Ukrainian throwaway from the 1990s on whose deck the country has no planes capable of landing. The US has [1,000](http://www.tomdispatch.com/archive/175338/nick_turse_pentagon%27s_planet%29_of_bases) or more bases around the world; other countries, a [handful](http://www.tomdispatch.com/blog/175592/engelhardt_monopolizing_war). The US spends as much on its military as the next [14 powers](http://www.sipri.org/research/armaments/milex/resultoutput/milex_15/the-15-countries-with-the-highest-military-expenditure-in-2011-table/view) (mostly allies) combined. In fact, it's investing an estimated [$1.45 trillion](http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/03/29/us-lockheed-fighter-idUSBRE82S03L20120329) to produce and operate a single future aircraft, the F-35 - more than any country, the US included, now spends on its national defence annually. The US military is singular in other ways, too. It alone has divided the globe - the complete world - into [six "commands"](http://www.tomdispatch.com/post/175308/tomgram%3A_engelhardt%2C_american_warscapes). With (lest anything be left out) an added command, [Stratcom](http://www.stratcom.mil/), for the heavens and another, recently established, for the only space not previously occupied, [cyberspace](http://www.stratcom.mil/factsheets/cyber_command/), where we're already unofficially "[at war](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/01/world/middleeast/obama-ordered-wave-of-cyberattacks-against-iran.html)". No other country on the planet thinks of itself in faintly comparable military terms. When its high command plans for its future "needs," thanks to Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Martin Dempsey, they repair (don't say "retreat") to a military base south of the capital where they argue out their future and war-game various possible crises while [striding across](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/12/us/top-general-dempsey-maps-out-us-military-future.html) a map of the world larger than a basketball court. What other military would come up with such a method? The president now has at his command not one, but two private armies. The first is the CIA, which in [recent years](http://www.salon.com/2011/04/28/petraeus_13/) has been [heavily militarised](http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/the-blurring-of-cia-and-military/2011/05/31/AGsLhkGH_story.html), is overseen by a former four-star general (who calls the job "[living the dream](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/28/us/politics/petraeus-is-eyeing-princetons-top-job-paper-says.html)"), and is running its own private assassination campaigns and drone air wars throughout the Greater Middle East. The second is an [expanding elite](http://www.tomdispatch.com/archive/175547/andrew_bacevich_golden_age_of_special_operations), the Joint Special Operations Command, [cocooned](http://www.tomdispatch.com/archive/175426/nick_turse_a_secret_war_in_120_countries) inside the US military, members of whom are now deployed to hot spots around the globe. The US Navy, with its [11 nuclear-powered aircraft carrier](http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1460) task forces, is dominant on the global waves in a way that only the British Navy might once have been; and the US Air Force controls the global skies in much of the world in a totally uncontested fashion. (Despite numerous wars and conflicts, the [last](http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/34182338/ns/us_news-military/#.UGzXexgVmHk) American plane possibly downed in aerial combat was in the first Gulf War in 1991.) Across much of the global south, there is no sovereign space Washington's drones can't penetrate to kill those [judged](http://www.tomdispatch.com/archive/175551/tom_engelhardt_assassin_in_chief) by the White House to be threats. In sum, the US is now the sole planetary [Top Gun](http://www.tomdispatch.com/archive/175368/When) in a way that empire-builders once undoubtedly fantasised about, but that none from Genghis Khan on have ever achieved: alone and essentially uncontested on the planet. In fact, by every measure (except success), the likes of it has never been seen. Blindsided by predictably unintended consequences By all the usual measuring sticks, the US should be supreme in a historically unprecedented way. And yet it couldn't be more obvious that it's not, that despite all the bases, elite forces, private armies, drones, aircraft carriers, wars, conflicts, strikes, interventions, and clandestine operations, despite a [labyrinthine intelligence bureaucracy](http://www.intelligence.gov/about-the-intelligence-community/) that never seems to stop growing and into which we pour a minimum of [$80bn a year](http://www.forbes.com/sites/lorenthompson/2012/02/13/80-billion-puzzle-the-part-of-the-pentagons-budget-you-wont-see/), **nothing seems to work out** in an imperially satisfying way. It couldn't be more obvious that this is not a glorious dream, but some kind of ever-expanding **imperial nightmare**. This should, of course, have been self-evident since at least early 2004, less than a year after the Bush administration invaded and occupied Iraq, when the roadside bombs started to explode and the suicide bombings to mount, while the comparisons of the US to Rome and of a prospective Pax Americana in the Greater Middle East to the Pax Romana vanished like a morning mist on a blazing day. Still, the wars against relatively small, ill-armed sets of insurgents dragged toward their dismally predictable ends. (It says the world that, after almost 11 years of war, the 2,000th US military death in Afghanistan [occurred](http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2012/09/30/afghan-us-insider-attacks/1603753/) at the hands of an Afghan "ally" in an "insider attack".) In those years, Washington continued to be regularly blindsided by the unintended consequences of its military moves. Surprises - none pleasant - became the order of the day and victories proved vanishingly rare. One thing seems obvious: a superpower military with unparalleled capabilities for one-way destruction **no longer** has the more basic **ability to impose its will** anywhere on the planet. Quite the opposite, US military power has been remarkably **discredited globally** by the most pitiful of forces. From Pakistan to Honduras, just about anywhere it goes in the old colonial or neocolonial world, in those regions known in the contested Cold War era as the Third World, resistance of one unexpected sort or another arises and failure ensues in some often long-drawn-out and spectacular fashion. Given the lack of enemies - a few thousand jihadis, a small set of minority insurgencies, a couple of feeble regional powers - why this is so, what exactly the force is that prevents Washington's success, remains mysterious. Certainly, it's in some way related to the more than half-century of decolonisation movements, rebellions and insurgencies that were a feature of the previous century. It also has something to do with the way economic heft has spread beyond the US, Europe and Japan - with the rise of the "tigers" in Asia, the explosion of the Chinese and Indian economies, the advances of Brazil and Turkey, and the movement of the planet toward some kind of genuine economic multi-polarity. It may also have something to do with the end of the Cold War, which put an end as well to several centuries of imperial or great power competition and left the sole "victor", it now seems clear, heading toward the exits wreathed in self-congratulation. Explain it as you will, it's as if the planet itself, or humanity, had somehow been [inoculated](http://www.tomdispatch.com/archive/175510/andy_kroll_how_empires_fall) against the imposition of imperial power, as if it now rejected it whenever and wherever applied. In the previous century, it took a half-nation, North Korea, backed by Russian supplies and Chinese troops to fight the US to a draw, or a popular insurgent movement backed by a local power, North Vietnam, backed in turn by the Soviet Union and China to defeat American power. Now, small-scale minority insurgencies, largely using roadside bombs and suicide bombers, are fighting American power to a draw (or worse) with no great power behind them at all. Think of the growing force that resists such military might as the equivalent of the "dark matter" in the universe. The evidence is in. We now know (or should know) that it's there, even if we can't see it. Washington's wars on autopilot After the last decade of military failures, stand-offs and frustrations, you might think that this would be apparent in Washington. After all, the US is now visibly an overextended empire, its sway waning from the Greater Middle East to Latin America, the [limits of its power](http://www.amazon.com/dp/0805090169/ref%3Dnosim/?tag=tomdispatch-20) increasingly evident. And yet, here's the curious thing: two administrations in Washington have drawn none of the obvious conclusions and no matter how the presidential election turns out, it's already clear that, in this regard, nothing will change. Even as military power has proven itself a bust again and again, our policymakers have come to rely ever more completely on a **military-first response** to global problems. In other words, we are not just a classically overextended empire, but also an overwrought one operating on some kind of **militarised autopilot**. Lacking is a learning curve. By all evidence, it's not just that there isn't one, but that there can't be one. Washington, it seems, now has only one mode of thought and action, no matter who is at the helm or what the problem may be, and it always involves, directly or indirectly, openly or clandestinely, the **application of militarised force**. Nor does it matter that each further application only destabilises some region yet more or undermines further what once were known as "American interests". Take Libya, as an example. It briefly seemed to count as a rare American military success story: a decisive intervention in support of a rebellion against a brutal dictator - so brutal, in fact, that the CIA previously [shipped](http://www.cnn.com/2012/09/06/us/us-libya-torture-report/index.html) "terrorist suspects", Islamic rebels fighting against the Gaddafi regime, there for torture. No US casualties resulted, while American and NATO air strikes were decisive in bringing a set of ill-armed, ill-organised rebels to power. In the world of unintended consequences, however, the fall of Gaddafi sent Tuareg mercenaries from his militias, armed with high-end weaponry, [across the border](http://www.truthdig.com/report/item/blue_man_coup_how_gadhafis_mercenaries_broke_mali_20120516/) into Mali. There, when the dust settled, the whole northern part of the country had come unhinged and fallen under the sway of Islamic extremists and al-Qaeda wannabes as other parts of North Africa threatened to destabilise. At the same time, of course, the first American casualties of the intervention occurred when Ambassador Christopher Stevens and three other Americans died in an attack on the Benghazi consulate and a local "safe house". With matters worsening regionally, the response couldn't have been more predictable. As Greg Miller and Craig Whitlock of the Washington Post recently [reported](http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/white-house-secret-meetings-examine-al-qaeda-threat-in-north-africa/2012/10/01/f485b9d2-0bdc-11e2-bd1a-b868e65d57eb_story.html?socialreader_check=0&amp;denied=1), in ongoing secret meetings, the White House is planning for military operations against al-Qaeda-in-the-Magreb (North Africa), now armed with weaponry pillaged from Gaddafi's stockpiles. These plans evidently include the approach used in Yemen (US special forces on the ground and CIA drone strikes), or a Somalia "formula" (drone strikes, special forces operations, CIA operations and the support of African proxy armies), or even at some point "the possibility of direct US intervention". In addition, Eric Schmitt and David Kilpatrick of the New York Times [report](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/10/03/world/africa/us-said-to-be-preparing-potential-targets-tied-to-libya-attack.html)that the Obama administration is "preparing retaliation" against those it believes killed the US ambassador, possibly including "drone strikes, special operations raids like the one that killed Osama bin Laden and joint missions with Libyan authorities". The near certainty that, like the previous intervention, this next set of military actions will only further destabilise the region with yet more unpleasant surprises and unintended consequences hardly seems to matter. Nor does the fact that, in crude form, the results of such acts are known to us ahead of time have an effect on the unstoppable urge to plan and order them. Such situations are increasingly [legion](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/10/05/world/africa/private-army-leaves-troubled-legacy-in-somalia.html) across the Greater Middle East and elsewhere. Take one other tiny example: Iraq, from which, after almost a decade-long military disaster, the "last" US units essentially fled in the [middle of the night](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/19/world/middleeast/last-convoy-of-american-troops-leaves-iraq.html) as 2011 ended. Even in those last moments, the Obama administration and the Pentagon were [still trying](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-04-13/army-chief-dempsey-willing-to-keep-u-s-troops-in-iraq-past-2011.html) to keep significant numbers of US troops there (and, in fact, did manage to [leave behind](http://news.antiwar.com/2012/10/01/us-may-keep-units-american-troops-in-iraq-despite-lack-of-authority/) possibly several hundred as trainers of elite Iraqi units). Meanwhile, Iraq has been supportive of the embattled Syrian regime and drawn ever closer to Iran, even as its own sectarian strife has ratcheted upward. Having watched this unsettling fallout from its last round in the country, [according to](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/25/world/middleeast/iraq-faces-new-perils-from-syrias-civil-war.html?pagewanted=2) the New York Times, the US is now negotiating an agreement "that could result in the return of small units of American soldiers to Iraq on training missions. At the request of the Iraqi government, according to General Caslen, a unit of Army Special Operations soldiers was recently deployed to Iraq to advise on counterterrorism and help with intelligence". Don't you just want to speak to those negotiators the way you might to a child: No, don't do that! The urge to return to the scene of their previous disaster, however, seems unstaunchable. You could offer various explanations for why our policymakers, military and civilian, continue in such a repetitive - and even from an imperial point of view - **self-destructive** vein in situations where unpleasant surprises are essentially guaranteed and **lack of success a given**. Yes, there is the military-industrial complex to be fed. Yes, we are interested in the control of crucial resources, especially energy, and so on. But it's probably more reasonable to say that a **deeply militarised mindset** and the **global maneuvers** that go with it are by now just part of the way of life of a Washington **eternally "at war".** They are the tics of a great power with the equivalent of Tourette's Syndrome. They happen because they can't help but happen, because they are **engraved** in the **policy DNA of our** national **security complex**, and can evidently no longer be altered. In other words, they can't help themselves.

### 2nc impact o/v

#### 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.

### 2nc perm top lvl

**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.

## 2nc alt debate

### 2nc alt overview

#### We aren’t disagreeing with what they do but how they do it --- the alternative is a prior question to renewable energy 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.

## link debate

### 2nc links

#### **B) expertise sharing ---** paternalistic rhetoric reifies imperial notions that the west is the best

**Burr 3** - Associate Professor, History U of Windsor (Christina, “Some Adventures of the Boys: Enniskillen Township's "Foreign Drillers," Imperialism, and Colonial Discourse, 1873-1923,” Labour / Le Travail, Vol. 51 (Spring, 2003), pp. 47-80 JSTOR)//A-Berg

I will explain in this essay how Enniskillen township's "foreign drillers," both as British subjects of the settler colony of Canada and agents of imperialism, went about constructing a coherent representation out of the new realities they con fronted while working in the colonial oil fields. I draw on a variety of post-colonial theories, histories, and works in literary criticism to illuminate the "peculiarities of the Canadians," and to explicate how they went about reinforcing the project of European capitalist imperialism while simultaneously disavowing the agency of non-white native Others. Second, I examine this group of workers as bearers of class, gender, and racial privilege in the oil fields where they were sent to work. For a significant proportion of Enniskillen's "foreign drillers," working for a large in ternational oil company provided them with the opportunity to secure supervisory and management-level jobs and a position of class privilege while living abroad. This no doubt would have eluded them had they spent their entire lives working at home in the local oil industry. Enniskillen's "foreign drillers" became part of **an imperial "overclass" by virtue of their "whiteness**," "Britishness," **and technical expertise in** the mining and refining of petroleum. Third, this essay contributes to the more recent body of historical literature on imperialism, which seeks to break down the boundaries between "Empire" and "colony" and "home" and "away." The co lonial oil fields became a space for the re-invention of Victorian ideals of domestic ity. The connections between the imperial economy and the local Enniskillen economy and the process of class formation are explicated in the essay. The wives of Enniskillen's "foreign drillers," who both maintained households in their hus bands' absences and sometimes joined them abroad, particularly after World War I, are also discussed. In a 1924 Maclean's article commemorating the golden jubilee of foreign drill ing, Victor Lauriston, a journalist and local Lambton County amateur historian, dubbed Petrolia "The Town of World Travelers." According to Lauriston, 134 drillers from Enniskillen township went on exploration and drilling expeditions to "foreign fields" between 1873 and the outbreak of World War I.6 Many of them went abroad more than once. A little-known aspect of Canadian history is that the "foreign drillers" from Lambton County, many of them from the town of Petrolia and the village of Oil Springs, provided the skilled labour and technical expertise necessary for the development ofthe global oil industry. The vagaries ofthe local oil market and the depletion ofthe oil resources in Enniskillen township by the late 1890s forced many skilled oil drillers to seek employment in "foreign fields." In an era when only the wealthy, soldiers, and diplomats travelled abroad extensively, Enniskillen drillers travelled to the oil-rich fields of Java, Borneo, Sumatra, Persia, Galicia, Germany, India, Newfoundland, Russia, Italy, the West Indies, and the United States. Virtually anywhere in the world where oil was discovered Enniskillen's drillers provided the skilled labour and technical expertise.

#### C) Renewable assistance to Mexico pads corporate coffers, while robbing the inhabitants of their land

**Pasqualetti** 11 (Martin J. Pasqualetti, Senior Sustainability Scientist, Global Institute of Sustainabillity, 5/25/2011, “Social Barriers to Renewable Energy Landscapes”, Wiley Online Library | JJ)

\*Oaxaca – wa-ha-kah

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

#### Economic engagement over renewable greenwashes hegemonic inequalities and consumerism—they merely reproduce existing geopolitical relations which makes extinction via sacrificial politics inevitable.

**Luke, 08** (Timothy W, Department of Political Science at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, The Politics of True Convenience or Inconvenient Truth: Struggles Over How to Sustain Capitalism, Democracy, and Ecology in the 21st Century, Environment and Planning, Vol. 40, pg 1811-1824//[SG])

This analysis is a brief critique of market-friendly, growth-perpetuating natural capitalism, particularly that present form which recognizes the past excesses of commercial development as the most likely causes of global climate change, as it revalorizes this industrial waste to concentrate and accelerate future commercial expansion. Such efforts seek to maintain the dynamic destructive developmental project of global exchange without making any radical criticism of its intrinsic inequalities, embedded waste, and frenetic consumerism. A thorough critique of this economic formation is a much larger undertaking than can be completed in one paper. Some of the key contradictions and basic conflicts, however, can be typified in a close critical reading of the broader cultural politics and political economy expressed in the environmental advocacy and thinking of Al Gore Jr, especially in his Nobel Prize winning activities on climate change in works like An Inconvenient Truth (2006a) or Earth in the Balance (2006b). Such a critique is meant neither to dismiss the dangers of global climate change nor to derogate the findings of ongoing scientific research, like that done by the co-awardees of the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize with Al Gore, namely, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Instead, it is meant to begin a pointed reassessment of how today's global climate-change debates often are too entangled in the reproduction of existing power relations. At best, they often **green-wrap corporate technocracy** with renewed institutional legitimacy that `**greenwashes'** an unsustainable economic status quo in the refreshing, but not cleansing, waters of sustainable development. While there is a need for systemic reforms in economic regulation, technological innovation, and social distribution, Gore's many engagements with big business, venture capital, and global media do not seem to promise such a transformative change. For some so-called US neoconservatives, especially in the days after September 11, 2001, redefining America's global `responsibility' to manage the current world system of states, economies, and societies became an almost obsessive calling. To Kagan (2003, page 96) this necessity was quite clear: everyone in the world must acknowledge and accept ``the new reality of American hegemony''. Others, like President George W Bush [43rd US President, hereinafter Bush (43)], determined this moment as a historic turning point where America must extend ``the benefits of freedom across the globe ... to bring the hope of democracy, development, free markets, and free trade to every corner of the world'' (Bush, 2002, page 2). This hegemony was regarded as a true convenience for Washington, but its risky workings also hold Earth in the balance with a host of inconvenient truths, including philosophical and political struggles over how to sustain capitalism, democracy, and ecology (Beck, 1992; Gore, 2006b; Luke, 1999) in the 21st century. For some the world will not be enough until Bush's vision is made real; for others the planet might not survive long enough for all to even see any of this action. Something went awry for Kagan, Bush, and the USA on the road from Kabul to Baghdad. Nonetheless, one must not mistake the reversals encountered by the Bush (43) administration in Iraq as a sign that all Americans will shrink from the struggles entailed by managing world affairs. Indeed, President Bush (43)'s defeated Democratic opponent from 2000, Al Gore Jr, arguably is thinking even bigger, better, and bolder thoughts about this task by outlining his own program of moral imperatives for the USA to serve as the planetary protector of the Earth and all its human and nonhuman inhabitants. An ironic, but inconvenient, truth about Gore's long march through the institutions of the American government (Gore, 2006a; 2006b) is how much his An Inconvenient Truth also aims, albeit after taking a softer path, ``to bring the hope of democracy, development, free markets, and free trade to every corner of the world''. In fact, Gore's worries (1992) about Earth hanging ``in the balance'' of ecological collapse appear to be morphing the old ``land ethic'' of Aldo Leopold into a new ``planetary ethic'' for managing the entire planet from the United States of America for maximum ecological and economic sustainability (Luke, 2005a, pages 228 ^ 238). This analysis critically examines one very visible version of such a `planetarian ethics', namely, the works of Al Gore on the ``inconvenient truth'' of global warming (Luke, 2005b, pages 154 ^ 171). By reconsidering how Gore articulates his view of the truth, to whom this truth appears to speak, and what social forces are likely to embrace his truth statements for dealing with the Earth's environment at a planetary scale of operation in various world scientific, economic, and political organizations, it also assesses the struggle over sustaining development and democracy in this century. While it appears morally just, one must ask if projects like Gore's Alliance for Climate Protection, or the recently announced Global Roundtable on Climate Change (GROCC), might only continue existing strategies for global economic growth that still serve inequitable geopolitical agendas after the missteps of the Bush (43) administration from New York to Baghdad to New Orleans. In a sense, much of this planetarian ethic was captured by the Nobel Prize Committee in its 2007 Peace Prize statement as it praised the IPCC and Albert Arnold (Al) Gore Jr ``for their efforts to build up and disseminate greater knowledge about man-made climate change, and to lay the foundations for the measures that are needed to counteract such change'' (Norwegian Nobel Committee, 2007). Indeed, who builds up this knowledge for whom, and then how, what, when, and why counteractive measures are to be made are central concerns for a planetarian politics in the coming decades. The intellectual roots spreading underneath Gore's program spring from common `sustainable development' thinking. In other words, how can the US sustain the true convenience of national prosperity amidst an environment facing too many inconvenient truths regarding the inequitable and irrational use of energy, resources, and information in a new global economy (Luke, 2005a)? That sustainable development is an ecopolitical project which might be neither sustainable nor developmental becomes irrelevant (Friedman, 2006). It is a palatable approach to ``green-wrap'' the economic and political project of ``sustainable degradation'' (Luke, 2006, pages 99 ^ 112) already now fully in play. Arguably, the world has already overshot its renewability limits since the 1970s. Memorable events like Earth Day 1970 and 1990 arguably bookend those decades in which cycles of sustainable degradation became a material reality. In his writings, Gore recounts how he too has fretted over ecological losses, which were first marked by others over thirty, forty, or fifty years ago (McNeill, 2000). Still, he claims that conditions today are dangerously different. Quantitative increases in many industrial pollutants are adducing qualitative changes in the Earth's environment and the equity of its global economy (Lamb, 1977; Long, 2004; Maslin, 2004). Hence, the next decade is a decisive conjuncture that demands radical action.

**D) Their heg advantage relies on cultural and epistemic binaries that legitimize racism and imperialistic 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 American 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.

#### E) Economic engagement over green issues greenwashes the status quo of hegemonic inequalities and frenetic consumerism—they merely reproduce existing geopolitical relations which makes extinction via sacrificial politics inevitable.

**Luke, 08** (Timothy W, Department of Political Science at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, The Politics of True Convenience or Inconvenient Truth: Struggles Over How to Sustain Capitalism, Democracy, and Ecology in the 21st Century, Environment and Planning, Vol. 40, pg 1811-1824//[SG])

This analysis is a brief critique of market-friendly, growth-perpetuating natural capitalism, particularly that present form which recognizes the past excesses of commercial development as the most likely causes of global climate change, as it revalorizes this industrial waste to concentrate and accelerate future commercial expansion. Such efforts seek to maintain the dynamic destructive developmental project of global exchange without making any radical criticism of its intrinsic inequalities, embedded waste, and frenetic consumerism. A thorough critique of this economic formation is a much larger undertaking than can be completed in one paper. Some of the key contradictions and basic conflicts, however, can be typified in a close critical reading of the broader cultural politics and political economy expressed in the environmental advocacy and thinking of Al Gore Jr, especially in his Nobel Prize winning activities on climate change in works like An Inconvenient Truth (2006a) or Earth in the Balance (2006b). Such a critique is meant neither to dismiss the dangers of global climate change nor to derogate the findings of ongoing scientific research, like that done by the co-awardees of the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize with Al Gore, namely, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Instead, it is meant to begin a pointed reassessment of how today's global climate-change debates often are too entangled in the reproduction of existing power relations. At best, they often **green-wrap corporate technocracy** with renewed institutional legitimacy that `**greenwashes'** an unsustainable economic status quo in the refreshing, but not cleansing, waters of sustainable development. While there is a need for systemic reforms in economic regulation, technological innovation, and social distribution, Gore's many engagements with big business, venture capital, and global media do not seem to promise such a transformative change. For some so-called US neoconservatives, especially in the days after September 11, 2001, redefining America's global `responsibility' to manage the current world system of states, economies, and societies became an almost obsessive calling. To Kagan (2003, page 96) this necessity was quite clear: everyone in the world must acknowledge and accept ``the new reality of American hegemony''. Others, like President George W Bush [43rd US President, hereinafter Bush (43)], determined this moment as a historic turning point where America must extend ``the benefits of freedom across the globe ... to bring the hope of democracy, development, free markets, and free trade to every corner of the world'' (Bush, 2002, page 2). This hegemony was regarded as a true convenience for Washington, but its risky workings also hold Earth in the balance with a host of inconvenient truths, including philosophical and political struggles over how to sustain capitalism, democracy, and ecology (Beck, 1992; Gore, 2006b; Luke, 1999) in the 21st century. For some the world will not be enough until Bush's vision is made real; for others the planet might not survive long enough for all to even see any of this action. Something went awry for Kagan, Bush, and the USA on the road from Kabul to Baghdad. Nonetheless, one must not mistake the reversals encountered by the Bush (43) administration in Iraq as a sign that all Americans will shrink from the struggles entailed by managing world affairs. Indeed, President Bush (43)'s defeated Democratic opponent from 2000, Al Gore Jr, arguably is thinking even bigger, better, and bolder thoughts about this task by outlining his own program of moral imperatives for the USA to serve as the planetary protector of the Earth and all its human and nonhuman inhabitants. An ironic, but inconvenient, truth about Gore's long march through the institutions of the American government (Gore, 2006a; 2006b) is how much his An Inconvenient Truth also aims, albeit after taking a softer path, ``to bring the hope of democracy, development, free markets, and free trade to every corner of the world''. In fact, Gore's worries (1992) about Earth hanging ``in the balance'' of ecological collapse appear to be morphing the old ``land ethic'' of Aldo Leopold into a new ``planetary ethic'' for managing the entire planet from the United States of America for maximum ecological and economic sustainability (Luke, 2005a, pages 228 ^ 238). This analysis critically examines one very visible version of such a `planetarian ethics', namely, the works of Al Gore on the ``inconvenient truth'' of global warming (Luke, 2005b, pages 154 ^ 171). By reconsidering how Gore articulates his view of the truth, to whom this truth appears to speak, and what social forces are likely to embrace his truth statements for dealing with the Earth's environment at a planetary scale of operation in various world scientific, economic, and political organizations, it also assesses the struggle over sustaining development and democracy in this century. While it appears morally just, one must ask if projects like Gore's Alliance for Climate Protection, or the recently announced Global Roundtable on Climate Change (GROCC), might only continue existing strategies for global economic growth that still serve inequitable geopolitical agendas after the missteps of the Bush (43) administration from New York to Baghdad to New Orleans. In a sense, much of this planetarian ethic was captured by the Nobel Prize Committee in its 2007 Peace Prize statement as it praised the IPCC and Albert Arnold (Al) Gore Jr ``for their efforts to build up and disseminate greater knowledge about man-made climate change, and to lay the foundations for the measures that are needed to counteract such change'' (Norwegian Nobel Committee, 2007). Indeed, who builds up this knowledge for whom, and then how, what, when, and why counteractive measures are to be made are central concerns for a planetarian politics in the coming decades. The intellectual roots spreading underneath Gore's program spring from common `sustainable development' thinking. In other words, how can the US sustain the true convenience of national prosperity amidst an environment facing too many inconvenient truths regarding the inequitable and irrational use of energy, resources, and information in a new global economy (Luke, 2005a)? That sustainable development is an ecopolitical project which might be neither sustainable nor developmental becomes irrelevant (Friedman, 2006). It is a palatable approach to ``green-wrap'' the economic and political project of ``sustainable degradation'' (Luke, 2006, pages 99 ^ 112) already now fully in play. Arguably, the world has already overshot its renewability limits since the 1970s. Memorable events like Earth Day 1970 and 1990 arguably bookend those decades in which cycles of sustainable degradation became a material reality. In his writings, Gore recounts how he too has fretted over ecological losses, which were first marked by others over thirty, forty, or fifty years ago (McNeill, 2000). Still, he claims that conditions today are dangerously different. Quantitative increases in many industrial pollutants are adducing qualitative changes in the Earth's environment and the equity of its global economy (Lamb, 1977; Long, 2004; Maslin, 2004). Hence, the next decade is a decisive conjuncture that demands radical action.

**F)** **Their rhetoric of narco-terrorism fuels militaristic intervention and violence.**

**Watt and Morales, ’10** - Peter Watt teaches and researches Latin American Studies at the University of Sheffield, Daniela Morales is a journalist who writes for La Jornada Michoacán, “Narcotrafficking in Mexico: Neoliberalism and a Militarized State,” Interview, http://upsidedownworld.org/main/mexico-archives-79/2696-narcotrafficking-in-mexico-neoliberalism-and-a-militarized-state)//A-Berg

PW: I think that in 2006 the Mexican political system got scared because the progressive candidate in the general elections, Andrés Manuel López Obrador, almost won. Well, it seems he did win but was prevented from taking power in a situation reminiscent of 1988, when the PRI fixed the election results to prevent the more progressive Cuathémoc Cárdenas from taking power. What's striking is that the population is totally against neoliberal policies, against NAFTA, that they want to change the Mexican system, reduce inequality, make wide-ranging changes. For example, Carlos Slim, the richest man on the planet, gains around 27 million dollars a day while the majority of Mexicans live on less than two dollars a day. Of course, in Mexico there's no organized insurgency on the scale of the FARC in Colombia, but there are many different groups fighting for the rights of workers, for protection of the natural environment, for the rights of women and I think the fear of Mexican elites and the US government was the threat of a deepening democracy, a democracy which rejects neoliberal economics and the political control of the US. DM: But don't you think that the US has forgotten Latin America somewhat because it is distracted by its invasions in the Middle East? PW: If only they would forget it a little! But it's not like that. The presence of US troops in Mexico would be illegal, but it would also provoke as much popular dissatisfaction in Mexico as in the US. Furthermore, Mexico was one of 12 Latin American republics to follow a decision by the International Criminal Court to deny impunity to US soldiers abroad. It's better for the US to train foreign police and soldiers, in this case Mexicans, because that way it will be their problem if someone complains about violations of human rights. In this way Washington has the advantage of appearing before the world as a neutral observer while it finances the regime with arms, training, paramilitaries and helicopters. The **discourse of US politicians changed** after the fall of the Berlin Wall; it's no longer Communism because in the 1980s they found another pretext – narcotrafficking – and following the attacks in New York in 2001 the justifications of the 'War on Drugs' became associated with themes like **security, the terrorist threat** from Islamic extremists**, the left, guerrilla insurgents,** those who are supposedly **transporting Weapons of Mass Destruction** through Latin America to mount an attack on the US. So when US politicians link all of that together they are planting the thought in the public mind that there is a terrorist threat from Mexico, from Colombia, leftist groups, left-leaning governments like those of Venezuela, Bolivia or Ecuador and they are associating them with narcotrafficking and it provides a very good pretext, particularly in the US where clearly there's little awareness of what's really going on. **The discourse of the Cold War is being repeated but now under the pretext of narcotrafficking, terrorism, Chavismo.** Meanwhile, the US military is overstretched in the Middle East, but the preoccupation has to do with the fact that many Latin American countries are integrating with each other. The traditional domination of the north is looking increasingly undermined and the manner in which they try to control the system that they have always dominated, and which is rejected by the people, is by means of coercion, by force, by arms. There has been talk of establishing a military base in Veracruz, for example, which would be, I suppose, to maintain and ensure the export of Mexican petroleum, but also for surveillance, to gather intelligence on what is happening in the Caribbean, in Mexico and in Central America. There's another US base in Puerto Rico and there are now some further seven military bases in Colombia because there's no longer a base in Ecuador and these things are all connected. If you look at US policy towards Mexico in terms of combating narcotrafficking it makes no sense. If you look beyond that, from a perverse perspective, it makes a lot of sense to US planners..
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#### C) 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

#### **We have a caselist ---**

#### you also get trade agreements

**Daga, 13** - director of research at Politicas Publicas para la Libertad, in Bolivia, and a visiting senior policy analyst at the Heritage Foundation (Sergio, “Economics of the 2013-2014 Debate Topic:

U.S. Economic Engagement Toward Cuba, Mexico or Venezuela”, National Center for Policy Analysis, 5/15, <http://www.ncpa.org/pdfs/Message_to_Debaters_6-7-13.pdf>)

Economic engagement between or among countries can take many forms, but this document will focus on government-to-government engagement through 1) international trade agreements designed to lower barriers to trade; and 2) government foreign aid; next, we will contrast government-to-government economic engagement with private economic engagement through 3) international investment, called foreign direct investment; and 4) remittances and migration by individuals. All of these areas are important with respect to the countries mentioned in the debate resolution; however, when discussing economic engagement by the U.S. federal government, some issues are more important with respect to some countries than to others.

#### Normalizing trade relations provides a topical Cuba aff

**French 9** – editor of and a frequent contributor to The Havana Note. She has led more than two dozen research trips to Cuba (Anya, “Options for Engagement A Resource Guide for Reforming U.S. Policy toward Cuba” <http://www.lexingtoninstitute.org/library/resources/documents/Cuba/USPolicy/options-for-engagement.pdf>)

the path to “normal” trade relations If the United States were to lift its trade embargo against Cuba, this would not automatically confer “normal” status to the bilateral trade relationship. It would mean that the United States and Cuba have the opportunity to begin trading in more goods and services than they have in the last fifty years. Whether much expanded trade actually occurs depends on whether the United States were to take additional steps beyond lifting the embargo: the most important of which is the provision of Normal Trade Relations (NTR). NTR is a technical term which refers to the provision of nondiscriminatory treatment toward trading partners. Cuba and North Korea are the only two countries to which the United States continues to deny “normal trade relations.” All other countries either have permanent normal trade relations or temporary, renewable normal trade relations with the United States.161 Assuming that the Cuba-specific trade sanctions contained in the Cuban Assets Control Regulations (the continuity of which was codified by the 1996 Helms-Burton Act) were to be eliminated, achieving normal trade relations between Cuba and the United States would not be a simple matter. A first stumbling block could be the 1974 Trade Act provision dubbed “Jackson-Vanik,” which prohibits non-market economy countries from receiving normal tariff treatment, entering into a bilateral commercial agreement, or receiving any U.S. government credits or loan guarantees, until the President has reported to Congress that such a country does not: 1) deny its citizens the right to emigrate, 2) impose an unreasonable tax or fine for emigrating, and 3) impose more than a “nominal tax, levy, fine, fee or other charge on any citizen as a consequence of the desire of such citizen to emigrate to the country of his choice.”162 Thus, Cuba’s restrictions on its citizens’ emigration rights pose an obstacle to normalization of bilateral trade. Only once the requirements set forth by the Jackson-Vanik amendment have been met, (and absent any other Cuba-specific sanctions, such as the Export Administration Act controls on countries found to be supporting international terrorism), could the United States begin negotiations of a bilateral commercial agreement with Cuba. To begin to extend normal trade relations to Cuba, the United States would need to enter into a reciprocal trade agreement with Cuba (not equivalent to a “free trade agreement”) that would provide a balance of trade benefits and protections to U.S. exports and commercial entities doing business with Cuba, at the same time it would provide such benefits to Cuba. Such an agreement would need to include protection for U.S. patents and trademarks and for “industrial rights and processes,” include a safeguard mechanism to prevent market disruptions due to trade, and provide that the agreement, and its continuation, be subject to the national security interests of both parties.163 Assuming bilateral relations had reached the appropriate milestones to begin discussing two-way trade, negotiating such an agreement could potentially take years, as both countries would need to adopt statutory and regulatory changes.

### at: w/m -> trade

#### 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.”

#### The consensus of the literature is MASSIVLY on our side, and the best metric for deciding what should be topical

**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.

## warming

### 2nc impact wall

#### Ice age coming now and casues extinction via rapid cooling --- the only thing that offsets it is CO2 which they decrease to solve warming --- its conceded so give us some leeway with explanation

#### Comparatively outweighs aff

**Whitehouse 12** – David, science adviser to the Global Warming Policy Foundation, 01/11, “Could rising CO2 levels help prevent the next ice age?” http://www.publicserviceeurope.com/article/1338/could-rising-co2-levels-help-prevent-the-next-ice-age)//a-berg

That the trees no longer completely canopy this land is due to mankind as we cleared the forests. That the ice is no longer here is due to global warming. Without doubt, we live in an interglacial period – a warm time between ice ages. There have been many during the current great glaciation. Some have these periods have been warmer than today, many shorter than our current interglacial's duration. The return of the ice would, short of a giant meteor strike, be the biggest disaster to face humanity. Vast swathes of the northern Hemisphere would be frozen. Northern Europe, Asia, Canada and the United States would have extensive regions rendered uninhabitable. Mankind would have to move south. There would be no choice as no technology could stop the ice or allow our high populations to life amongst it. Some believe the return of the ice will not happen for thousands of years, other that the signs could be visible within decades. But could it be that the greenhouse gasses being pumped into the atmosphere, that many believe are responsible for a recent warming of the planet, might counteract the forces bringing us a new glaciation? Could it be that greenhouse gasses might actually stave off the return of the ice and save the lives of tens of millions, if not civilisation itself? A recent study by scientists at Cambridge University and published in the Journal Nature Geoscience suggests that the carbon dioxide might extend the current interglacial until carbon dioxide levels fall. They believe that the atmospheric concentration of CO2 must be about 240 parts per million before glaciation could start. Currently, it is about 390 ppm. In a 1999 essay, Sir Fred Hoyle said: "The renewal of ice-age conditions would render a large fraction of the world's major food-growing areas inoperable and so would inevitably lead to the extinction of most of the present human population. We must look to a sustained greenhouse effect to maintain the present advantageous world climate. This implies the ability to inject effective greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, the opposite of what environmentalists are erroneously advocating."

#### Worst case it takes 100 years

**Page 11**-Article Cites Study Conducted by the US National Science Foundation, Quotes Anreas Schmitner, Professor @ the College of Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Sciences [Lewis, The Register, Free Whitepaper-IBM System Networking RackSwitch G8264, “Global Warming Much Less Serious than Thought-New Science,” 11/25/2011, <http://www.theregister.co.uk/2011/11/25/runaway_warming_unlikely/>]

Climate scientists funded by the US government have announced new research in which they have established that the various doomsday global warming scenarios are in fact extremely unlikely to occur, and that the scenarios considered likeliest - and used for planning by the world's governments - are overly pessimistic. The new study improves upon previous results by including data from the remote past, rather than only examining records from recent times. "Many previous climate sensitivity studies have looked at the past only from 1850 through today, and not fully integrated paleoclimate data, especially on a global scale," says Andreas Schmittner, professor at the College of Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Sciences at Oregon State uni. "When you reconstruct sea and land surface temperatures from the peak of the last Ice Age 21,000 years ago – which is referred to as the Last Glacial Maximum – and compare it with climate model simulations of that period, you get a much different picture. "If these paleoclimatic constraints apply to the future, as predicted by our model, the results imply less probability of extreme climatic change than previously thought," Schmittner adds. The baseline assumption of climate science at the moment is that given a doubling of atmospheric CO2 compared to pre-industrial levels the most probable result is that the Earth would see a surface temperature rise average of 3°C - and that there would be a significant chance of much bigger, perhaps fatal rises. Schmittner and his colleagues' analysis says that the planet's climate simply can't be this sensitive to CO2 changes, however, or much more extreme events should have occurred at certain points in the past - and they did not. For instance, if the climate were sensitive enough that doubled CO2 could mean catastrophic warming, the low carbon levels seen 21,000 years ago should have resulted in an equally lifeless iceball planet. "Clearly, that didn't happen," Schmittner says. "Though the Earth then was covered by much more ice and snow than it is today, the ice sheets didn't extend beyond latitudes of about 40 degrees, and the tropics and subtropics were largely ice-free – except at high altitudes. These high-sensitivity models overestimate cooling." According to the new improved analysis, the most probable result as and when double CO2 occurs is actually a rise of just 2.3°C - only just above the 2°C limit which international climate efforts are seeking to stay within. Plainly there's no great need to fear a rise above 450 parts per million (ppm) CO2, as people currently do - in fact there's no likely prospect of getting near a 2°C temperature rise for a century or more at present rates of CO2 increase (rising about about 2 ppm/year at the moment from a level of 390-odd). And Schmittner and his colleagues' results show a much tighter grouping of possible futures, too, so the scope for way-out doomsday scenarios is hugely reduced. The Australian [quotes](http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/health-science/climate-forecasts-exaggerated-science-journal/story-e6frg8y6-1226205464958) Schmittner as saying: "Now these very large changes (predicted for the coming decades) can be ruled out, and we have some room to breathe and time to figure out solutions to the problem." The new study [is published](http://www.sciencemag.org/content/early/2011/11/22/science.1203513.abstract?sid=d47377ad-6df7-4f10-a1d7-ac371826abcf) in top-ranking boffinry journal Science. The research was funded by the US National Science Foundation. ®

#### That means intervening actors and tech solve

**Michaels 7** – Cato senior fellow (Patrick, 2/2, Live with Climate Change, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=7502)

Consequently, the best policy is to live with some modest climate change now and encourage economic development, which will generate the capital necessary for investment in the more efficient technologies of the future. Fortunately, we have more time than the alarmists suggest. The warming path of the planet falls at the lowest end of today's U.N. projections. In aggregate, our computer models tell us that once warming is established, it tends to take place at a constant, not an increasing, rate. Reassuringly, the rate has been remarkably constant, at 0.324 degrees F per decade, since warming began around 1975. The notion that we must do "something in 10 years," repeated by a small but vocal band of extremists, enjoys virtually no support in the truly peer reviewed scientific literature. Rather than burning our capital now for no environmental gain (did someone say "ethanol?"), let's encourage economic development so people can invest and profit in our more efficient future. People who invested in automobile companies that developed hybrid technology have been rewarded handsomely in the past few years, and there's no reason to think environmental speculators won't be rewarded in the future, too.