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**Mexico is turning towards China for energy exports.**

**Garcia 8/9** (David, 8/9/13, “Mexico ramping up oil exports to China, India,” http://in.reuters.com/article/2013/08/09/mexico-oil-idINDEE97809B20130809)//DR. H

Mexico is pushing to double crude oil exports to China next year and boost India-bound shipments, the next stage of a long-term plan to diversify oil sales **away** from an increasingly energy-independent United States.

Mexico is also open to importing light crude supplies from the United States, the country's top oil trade executive said in an interview, a sign that the world's No. 10 oil producer may be ready to give up decades of total crude oil self-sufficiency in order to take advantage of a growing glut of U.S. shale oil.

"We expect to market increasing volumes of our crudes" to both China and India, said Luis Felipe Luna, CEO of P.M.I. Comercio Internacional, the international oil trading arm of Mexico's state oil monopoly Pemex.

Crude oil shipments to China, which have risen from zero in 2010 to more than 20,000 bpd so far this year, will reach a yearly average of 30,000 barrels per day (bpd) but could more than double in 2014, said Luna.

**US influence directly trades off with China – every barrel of oil purchased is a barrel lost.**

**Fergusson 12** (Robbie, Masters in China In The International Arena from the University of Glasgow, e-International Relations, 7/23/12, “The Chinese Challenge to the Monroe Doctrine,” http://www.e-ir.info/2012/07/23/does-chinese-growth-in-latin-america-threaten-american-interests/)//DR. H

American concerns over displacement

The U.S has some reason to be concerned by the economic implications of China’s resource drive in Latin America because “while the United States has traditionally looked to Latin America as its source of numerous raw materials and a market for its finished products, China is fast replacing the United States in these roles.” [37] The United States has no intention of being usurped in its role as chief beneficiary of the regions energy resources, but **“for every barrel of oil that China purchases from Latin America, there is potentially one less barrel available for the U.S”** [38] It is of course extremely premature to be using words such as usurped as China’s involvement in the region is at a very early stage and its energy interests are not overly well defined, but already, “China’s total consumption of the five basic commodities – grain, meat, oil, coal and steel – has already surpassed that of the USA in all but oil,” [39] leading many analysts such as Hutton to wonder how the global supply of energy can cope with the emergence of such a hungry economy without conflict over increasingly scarce resources. [40]

The development of China and its interests in the region is therefore key. Roett & Paz argue that “what matters most… for Sino-Latin American energy relations is not where China is today but how it compares with its position in the world at the start of the twenty-first century and where it is likely to be in 2030.” [41] **Due to the triangular relationship between China, the U.S, and Latin America, any shift of the equilibrium towards China cannot fail to impact upon the United States.** Bajpaee moots the idea:

While not a zero-sum game, growing inter-linkages and interdependence between China and Latin America is likely to come at the cost of the United States’ relations with its neighbours, which will only undermine U.S ability to access the region’s energy resources. This will force the U.S to rely on energy resources from more remote and less stable regions, such as West Africa, the Caspian and the Middle East. [42]

**That’s key to Chinese energy security and prevents oil shocks.**

**Xiaoxia 5/6** – (2013, Wen, Economic Observer, Worldcrunch, “IN AMERICA'S BACKYARD: CHINA'S RISING INFLUENCE IN LATIN AMERICA,” http://www.worldcrunch.com/china-2.0/in-america-039-s-backyard-china-039-s-rising-influence-in-latin-america/foreign-policy-trade-economy-investments-energy/c9s11647/)

Initially, China’s activities in Latin America were limited to the diplomatic level. By providing funds and assisting in infrastructure constructions, China managed to interrupt diplomatic ties between poor Latin countries and Taiwan. Since then, with China's economic boom, the supply of energy and resources has gradually become a problem that plagues China -- and its exchanges with Latin America thus are endowed with real substantive purpose. Among the numerous needs of China, **the demand for oil has always been the most powerful driving force**. In the past 30 years, China has consumed one-third of the world's new oil production and become the world's second-largest oil importer. More than half of China's oil demand depends on imports, which increases the instability of its energy security. Diversification is inevitable. In this context, Latin America and its huge reserves and production capacity naturally became a destination for China. China must better protect its energy supply, and can't just play the simple role of consumer. It must also help solidify the important links of the petroleum industry supply chain. Indeed, the China National Petroleum Corporation frequently appears in Latin American countries, and China’s investment and trade in the Latin American countries are also focused on its energy sector. In the opinion of many European and American scholars, China's current practice isn’t much different from that of Western colonizers of the last century. These scholars believe that China doesn’t care about local human rights or the state of democracy when dealing with countries. **All China is interested in is establishing long-term, stable economic relations.** This realistic path is exactly opposite to that of America's newfound idealism. Thus China has become a close collaborator of certain Latin American countries, such as Venezuela, that are in sharp conflict with the United States. The global financial crisis of 2008 was a chance for China to become an increasingly important player in Latin American. As Europe and the United States were caught in a financial quagmire, China, with nearly $3 trillion of foreign exchange reserves as backing, embarked on "funds-for-assets" transactions with Latin American countries. So what does China want exactly in entering Latin American? Is it to obtain a stable supply of energy and resources, and thus inadvertently acquire political influence? Or the other way round? Presumably most U.S. foreign policy-makers are well aware of the answer. **China's involvement in the Latin American continent doesn’t constitute a threat to the United States, but brings benefits.** It is precisely because China has reached "loans-for-oil" swap agreements with Venezuela, Brazil, Ecuador and other countries that it brings much-needed funds to these oil-producing countries in South America. Not only have these funds been used in the field of oil production, **but they have also safeguarded the energy supply of the United States**, as well as stabilized these countries' livelihood -- and to a certain extent reduced the impact of illegal immigration and the drug trade on the U.S.

**Chinese Energy insecurity sparks miscalculated Asian war.**

**Clement ’12** [Nicholas, China and India Vie for Energy Security, May 25, <http://www.2point6billion.com/news/2012/05/25/china-and-india-vie-for-energy-security-11177.html>]

The competitive relationship between China and India has become a defining feature of the strategic environment across emerging Asia. While both nations are currently not in direct conflict, there are several areas of strategic interest which could potentially be clashing points in the future. Energy security is one such point; and while escalation between China and India is unlikely, it is important to note that the energy policies of each nation are largely based on geopolitical considerations. First, it is important to recognize that energy cooperation between China and India over the past decade has been increasing. In January 2006, for example, both nations signed a memorandum of cooperation in the field of oil and natural gas which encouraged collaboration between their enterprises, including joint exploration and development of hydrocarbon resources. Escalations in global energy prices and political uncertainties in the Middle East, however, have resulted in both countries looking for long-term arrangements. As China and India are increasingly forced to rely on the global oil market to meet their energy demands, they are more susceptible to supply disruptions and price fluctuations. In response, both countries have partly followed geopolitical energy policies, based on notions of traditional security. Ultimately, what we see is the arrival of military and political planning in trying to solve the issue of natural resource shortages. Energy security is of utmost strategic importance to China and India if they hope to continue to expand their economies. Rapid growth rates in both countries have grown in tandem with increased demand for energy. By 2020, it is estimated that China and India combined will account for roughly one-third of the world’s GDP and, as such, will require vast amounts of energy to fuel their economies. As such, the competition for energy resources such as oil and natural gas will only become fiercer. An important aspect of energy security is maritime control in the Asia-Pacific oceans. The sea lines of communication that run through Asia effectively act as the vital arteries for both countries. Maritime security is thus of major national interest for both China and India, and is directly linked to their energy security. Recent military modernization within China has been focused towards upgrading its naval capabilities, and ultimately moving towards creating a strong and powerful blue-water navy. India’s drive for maritime dominance has resulted in its naval budget increasing from US$1.3 billion in 2001 to US$3.5 billion in 2006, with plans to further increase naval spending 40 percent by 2014. China’s thirst for oil has doubled over the last decade, and is only predicted to rise. Similarly, India relies on the energy shipped through maritime regions to fund its own industrialization. India continues to state its maritime goals in pure geopolitical terms, even explicitly acknowledging in their 2004 Maritime Doctrine that “control of the choke points would be useful as a bargaining chip in the international power game, where the currency of military power remains a stark reality.” Thus it is clear that energy security has been directly translated into a national security issue, which has both political and military implications. The geopolitical rivalry in Myanmar between China and India provides great insight into their adversarial energy relationship. In Myanmar, both Chinese and Indian geopolitical and geoeconomic interests collide, and as such, may become a point of contention between China and India. Myanmar holds vast strategic importance for both China and India due to its location and abundance of natural resources. It has vast reserves of natural gas, so for both China and India it is presented as a source of energy free from the geopolitical risks of the Middle East. There has thus been major competition between China and India for access to the market. India has signed a US$40 billion deal with Myanmar for the transfer of natural gas, and has also had frequent discussions about building a pipeline from Myanmar to India. However, China has increasingly gained the most from Myanmar’s available resources. In 2005, for example, Myanmar reneged on a deal with India, and instead signed a 30-year contract with China for the sale of 6.5 trillion cubic liters of natural gas. For China, Myanmar is also important as it provides a land route to the Indian Ocean that vital resources could be shipped through in place of the Strait of Malacca. The potential for the Malacca Strait to be blockaded by a rival is of great concern to China, since as much as 85 percent of China’s oil is shipped through the region. For India, Myanmar is also of a strategic importance due to its location. China is already on friendly terms with Pakistan and has been expanding its presence in the Indian Ocean, thus giving India a feeling of Chinese encirclement. India’s interest in Myanmar directly relates to the growing presence and influence of China in the region. China’s “string of pearls” strategy refers to attempts to negotiate basing rights along the sea route linking the Middle East with China, including creating strong diplomatic ties with important states in the region. Not only does this contain India’s naval projection of power, it also directly threatens India’s energy access and the regional balance of power. While military confrontation between China and India remains unlikely, it is important to recognize that China and India’s energy policies revolve around traditional ideas of security, which highlight military and political balancing. Their energy policies are largely based on geopolitical and security considerations, and not just with regards to the global oil market. As such, it is critical for there to be ongoing diplomatic engagement between China and India to avoid unnecessary or accidental escalation.

**Kerry’s focusing on Middle Eastern peace talks -- a shift in his focus causes Israel-Palestine war.**

**YL 11/7,** YaLibnan, Lebanon News Service, 2013, “Kerry warns Israel of Palestinian uprising if peace talks fail,” http://www.yalibnan.com/2013/11/07/kerry-warns-israel-of-palestinian-uprising-if-peace-talks-fail/)//DR. H

U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry warned Israel on Thursday that it could face a third Palestinian uprising and deepening international isolation if American-brokered peace negotiations failed.

Both Israel and the Palestinians have given grim assessments of the lack of progress in their talks, which the United States helped revive last July after a three-year hiatus.

Kerry, speaking in Jordan a day after a visit to Israel, where he appealed for limits on its settlement building in the occupied West Bank, reported the negotiations had made “significant progress” in some areas.

He said it was important to keep aiming towards a full “final status” accord tackling issues at the core of the decades-old conflict, in contrast with more modest interim deals plagued by diplomatic deadlock and years of violence.

In an interview with Israel’s Channel 2 television recorded in Jerusalem before he left for Amman, Kerry painted a bleak picture of what might lie ahead if peace is not achieved.

“I mean, does Israel want a third Intifada?” he asked, referring to the danger of a new Palestinian uprising to follow those that erupted in 1987 and 2000.

“If we do not find the way to find peace, there will be an increasing isolation of Israel, there will be an increasing campaign of delegitimization of Israel that has been taking place on an international basis.”

Kerry was due to meet Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas in Amman later on Thursday before returning to Jerusalem for more talks with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu on Friday.

“Both Prime Minister Netanyahu and President Abbas reaffirmed their commitment to these negotiations despite the fact that at moments there are obviously tensions,” Kerry said.

Friction over the talks has risen in the last week because of Israeli plans, announced in tandem with its release of 26 Palestinian prisoners, for some 3,500 new homes for Jewish settlers in the occupied West Bank and East Jerusalem.

Palestinians have warned of a crisis if Israel continues to insist that they effectively agreed to turn a blind eye to the settlement expansion, in exchange for the progressive release of 104 long-serving inmates.

After meeting Abbas on Wednesday in the West Bank city of Bethlehem, Kerry said Palestinians had never condoned settlements, which they and many countries view as illegal and the United States terms illegitimate.

Palestinians fear the enclaves, built on land Israel captured in the 1967 Middle East war and which they seek for a future state, will deny them a viable country. Israel cites biblical and historical links to the territory.

Kerry, whose shuttle diplomacy helped to revive the talks, has set a nine-month schedule for an agreement, despite widespread skepticism.

“I remain absolutely committed to this ability to get a final status (agreement),” Kerry said at a news conference in Amman, repeatedly warning of “prolonged, continued conflict”, violence and confrontation if the talks failed.

**Plan shifts Kerry’s focus.**

**Anderson and Grewell 2k,** (Terry L., Executive Director of the Property and Environment Research Center, J. Bishop, former research associate for PERC. He is a graduate of Stanford University, the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, and Northwestern Law School, “The Greening of Foreign Policy”, PERC Policy Series: PS-20, December 2000, <http://www.perc.org/pdf/ps20.pdf>)

Greater international environmental regulation can increase international tension. Foreign policy is a bag of goods that includes issues from free trade to arms trading to human rights. Each new issue in the bag weighs it down, lessening the focus on other issues and even creating conflicts between issues. Increased environmental regulations could cause countries to lessen their focus on international threats of violence such as the sale of ballistic missiles or border conflicts between nations. As countries must watch over more and more issues arising in the international policy arena, they will stretch the resources necessary to deal with traditional international issues. As Schaefer (2000, 46) writes, “Because diplomatic currency is finite . . . it is critically important that the United States focus its diplomatic efforts on issues of paramount importance to the nation. Traditionally, these priorities have been opposing hostile domination of key geographic regions, supporting our allies, securing vital resources,

**Israel-Palestine war causes extinction -- risk of war is high.**

**Beres 11/11,** Louis, 2013, “The Future of Israel's Nuclear Deterrence: Debates about Iran and Palestinian statehood will have an effect on Israel's mode of self-defense,” http://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2013/11/11/iran-israel-and-the-nuclear-threat-in-the-middle-east)//DR. H

A Palestinian state would make Israel's conventional capabilities more problematic; it could thereby heighten the chances of **a regional nuclear war**. Although Palestine itself would obviously be non-nuclear, its overall strategic impact could nonetheless be magnified by continuously unfolding and more-or-less unpredictable developments in Egypt, Syria, Libya, Lebanon and elsewhere in this roiling and chaotic area.

A nuclear war could arrive in Israel not only as a "bolt-from-the-blue" surprise missile attack, but also as a result, intended or inadvertent, of escalation. If certain already extant enemy states were to begin conventional or biological attacks upon Israel, Jerusalem might respond, sooner or later, with aptly "proportionate" nuclear reprisals. Or, if these enemy states were to begin their aggressions with conventional attacks upon Israel, Jerusalem's own conventional reprisals might be met, in the future, with enemy nuclear counterstrikes.

For now, this would become possible only if a still-nuclearizing Iran were spared any final forms of Israeli or American preemptive interference, actions appropriately identifiable in law as "anticipatory self-defense." As a preemptive attack against Iran now seems operationally implausible, it is reasonable to assume that a persuasive Israeli conventional deterrent, at least to the extent that it would prevent enemy conventional and/or biological attacks in the first place, could reduce Israel's escalatory exposure to a nuclear war.

Pertinent questions arise. With its implicit ("deliberately ambiguous") nuclear capacities, why should Israel need a conventional deterrent at all? After all, even after Palestinian statehood, wouldn’t all rational enemy states desist from launching any conventional or biological attacks upon Israel out of an entirely sensible fear of Israeli nuclear retaliation?

Not necessarily. Aware that Israel would cross the nuclear threshold only in very extraordinary circumstances, these enemy states could be convinced – rightly or wrongly – that as long as their attacks remained recognizably non-nuclear, Israel would always respond in kind.

The only credible way for Israel to deter large-scale conventional attacks after the creation of Palestine would be by maintaining visible and large-scale conventional capabilities. Of course, enemy states contemplating any first-strike attacks using chemical or biological weapons are apt to take more seriously Israel's nuclear deterrent, whether newly-disclosed, or still "in the basement." A strong conventional capability is needed by Israel essentially to deter or to preempt conventional attacks, attacks that could, if they were undertaken, lead quickly via escalation to various forms of unconventional war.

However unforeseen, Palestine, already a "nonmember observer state" at the United Nations, would have measurably corrosive effects on power and peace in the Middle East. As, by definition, the creation of this particular Arab state would come at the territorial expense of Israel, the Jewish state's strategic depth would promptly and irretrievably diminish. Over time, Israel's conventional capacity to ward off enemy attacks could be commensurately reduced.

If certain enemy states were to perceive Israel's own sense of expanding weakness and possible desperation, this could imply a strengthening of Israel's nuclear deterrent. If, however, front-line enemy states did not perceive such an enhancement among Israel's decision-makers, these states, animated by Israel's conventional force deterioration, could be encouraged to attack. Paradoxically, for Israel, even the "successful" defeat of Arab/Islamic state enemies in an unconventional war could prove intolerable. Here, after all, the results of a nuclear war, or perhaps even a chemical or biological war, could prove calamitous for the "winner," as well as the "loser."

To be sure, a meaningful risk of regional nuclear war in the Middle East exists independently of any Palestinian state. Still, this unprecedented risk would be further enlarged if a 23rd Arab state were to appear more-or-less simultaneously with Iranian nuclear weapons. Above anything else, Israel must now do what is needed to prevent such coinciding and mutually-reinforcing and **existential perils.**

#### Text: The United States federal government should establish a Security and Prosperity Partnership to offer efficiency-based concessions to Mexico in exchange for a technical negotiations framework to increase its economic engagement in energy infrastructure towards Mexico.

#### The counterplan is distinct and vital to policy sustainability – concessions are key to remedy lack of trust, which undermines future cooperation

**Anderson and Sands, 7** – \*Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Alberta, \*\*Senior Fellow, Hudson Institute (Greg, Christopher, “Negotiating North America: The Security and Prosperity Partnership”, Hudson Institute White Papers, Summer 2007)//SJF

U.S. wealth and strength are not always decisive in negotiations with Canada and Mexico; in fact, both U.S. neighbors have well-developed diplomatic traditions of **resistance to U.S. pressure**. National sovereignty is routinely asserted against U.S. requests and prerogatives, and nationalist lobbies in Canada and Mexico raise an outcry whenever agreements with the United States appear to reflect U.S. priorities at the expense of national autonomy. It is possible under certain circumstances to override this sentiment, but not without costs to future cooperation. Additionally, when the United States presses its advantages in bilateral or trilateral negotiations, it often gets minimal, ―satisficing‖ concessions from Ottawa and Mexico City rather than creative offers of assistance that advance shared goals.

This dynamic, although frustrating to some in Washington, has been a persistent feature of U.S. relations with its neighbors. Yet the United States can often overcome the defensive instincts of its neighbors by structuring negotiations in such a way that the U.S. advantages are minimized, treating negotiators for Canada and Mexico as equals and partners and avoiding any explicit resort to its advantages of size. In practice, such advantages are never far from the minds of our negotiating partners, and so can often go unspoken.

The postwar growth of regimes and institutions like the NAFTA and the World Trade Organization has been fueled by the desire of relatively weaker countries to curb the ability of stronger ones to resolve economic disputes by capitalizing on asymmetrical advantages. Following Kenneth Oye, we can suggest three views on cooperative behavior in North America, some of which we have seen employed by U.S. negotiators in the past.4

First, what are the ―payoffs‖ or incentives for cooperation? These ―payoffs‖ are not always static, and can sometimes be altered by the players involved. The United States has tried to overcome the defensive instincts of its neighbors by structuring negotiations in such a way that the U.S. advantages are minimized, treating negotiators for Canada and Mexico as equals and partners and avoiding any explicit resort to its advantages of size. The Bush administration chose to make the SPP a negotiation process among technical specialists and agency regulators hoping that the technical nature of the issues under discussion would promote science, or efficiency based compromises based on the merits of proposals rather than on which of the countries made a particular proposal.

Second, one of the most significant incentives for cooperation rests in extending the so-called ―shadow of the future.‖ Incentives for cooperation rise in the presence of expectations about benefits from future cooperation. In other words, is cooperation likely to be a one-off exercise in which players must get as much as they can, or is there some expectation that there will be future opportunities for mutually beneficial cooperation? As an open-ended negotiation process, rather than a negotiation intended to produce a specific treaty or executive agreement, the SPP offers Canada, Mexico and the United States **continuous incentives to cooperate** on present issues to earn consideration on future matters that may be more important to each.

**The SPP’s gradual regulations process generates political will and avoids “big bang” reforms – even if the plan’s controversal, popular bureaucratic interest sways political officials, which is key to mobilize action**

**Ackleson and Kastner, 5** – jointly coordinate the Frontier Program, an interdisciplinary program for the historical studies of border security, food safety, and trade policy, \*assistant professor, Department of Government, New Mexico State University, \*\*assistant professor, Department of Diagnostic Medicine / Pathobiology, Kansas State University (Jason, Justin, *The American Review of Canadian Studies*, “THE SECURITY AND PROSPERITY PARTNERSHIP OF NORTH AMERICA”, 12/6/5)//SJF

The SPP seeks to repeat this 19th-century model of regulatory coordination. Canada’s, America’s, and Mexico’s Henry Chaplins, Jeremiah Rusks, Daniel Salmons, and George Browns are to work together—towards “action-forcing events” and real deadlines spelled out in the SPP agenda.37 The SPP is, in practical terms, a large, politically-supported framework that gives structure and energy to smaller agency-to-agency projects, often in the regulatory realm, that are being undertaken by the three governments. Individual regulators then engage in a kind of low-level diplomacy with their counterparts in the other capitals. One official at Foreign Affairs Canada who deals with the U.S. file summed it up well: **the SPP represents “aggressive incrementalism rather than a ‘big bang’** approach.”38

Most officials we spoke with generally supported this approach. As another senior policy official in Canada involved with the SPP negotiations argued, some SPP initiatives could not be pushed through on a treaty level. Instead, timelines, deliverables, and granular-level detail for bureaucrats are the focus.39

Although the SPP and its related agreements are not unique as an executive-to-executive branch policy framework, two features do make it interesting. First, the bureaucratic negotiations are backed up by high-level political will generated by the leaders of each state. As officials noted, Presidents Bush and Fox and Prime Minister Martin agreed in March 2005 to the broad principles but then tasked cabinet officials in their respective governments to proceed with the actual work. In the U.S. case, the security agenda was given to Secretary Chertoff at the Department of Homeland Security; the prosperity agenda is being handled by Secretary Gutierrez in the Commerce Department. In Canada, the lead agency for SPP is the Privy Council’s Office; in Mexico, it is the Presidencía (and the Secretaría de Economía). In this sense, there is **significant political backing**—at least at the moment—for the SPP. As mentioned above, this political will also creates various action-forcing events within the bureaucracies (such as timetables for progress), thereby propelling movement on the issues. The SPP process requires periodic reports to the high level political officials. It should be noted, however, that bureaucratic inertia can still persist, and that high-level political changes in each country in the short-term (President Fox’s term is up in 2006 and Prime Minister Martin likely faces an election in 2006 as well) may affect the durability of the agreement. These are points which we will return to in the conclusion.

**Anxiety and fear of insecurity create hatred and prevent inner peace --- we must recognize that we cannot grasp the true reality of war.**

**Lama** **Yeshe, 1983**. Thubten “Anxiety in the Nuclear Age,” <http://www.lamayeshe.com/index.php?sect=article&id=128>.

What’s the good of worrying about things twenty-four hours a day, disturbing your mind and preventing yourself from having a peaceful and joyful life? It’s a waste of time. Nothing’s going to change just because you’re worrying about it. If something’s already broken, it’s broken. Worrying won’t fix it. This earth has always been destructive by nature, nuclear age or not. There’s always blood flowing someplace or another. Look at world history. It’s always been like this. Buddhism calls this interdependent origination, and that’s how the human mind works. Take America’s war in Vietnam, for example. That brought people together in a movement for peace. That’s also interdependent. Some people saw the horrible suffering, confusion, misery and destruction wrought by others, so they went the other way, thinking, “That’s not right,” and despite the difficulties, created a movement of peace and love. But the right way to eliminate harm from this earth is to first free your mind from the emotional disturbances that cause irrational fear of destruction, and then educate yourself and others in how to bring peace to the world. The first thing you must do is to control your own mind and commit yourself: “From now on, no matter what happens, I’m never going to use weapons to kill any human being.” That’s where world peace starts. Human beings can control their minds and actions such that they will never kill others; people can learn to see that harming others destroys not only the others’ pleasure and happiness but their own as well. Through this kind of education, we can prevent nuclear energy from destroying the world. We can’t just campaign for the complete abolition of nuclear energy. Like electricity, nuclear energy is useful if employed the right way. If you’re careless with electricity, it can kill you too, can’t it? With right knowledge and method, we should campaign to ensure that everybody on earth determines, “I will never use nuclear weapons to kill human beings.” If that happened, a nuclear conflagration could never occur. Not that it matters, but personally, I don’t believe that nuclear energy is going to destroy the earth. I do believe, however, that human beings are capable of making a program to ensure that people everywhere, irrespective of whether they live in communist or capitalist societies, determine not to use nuclear weapons to kill other human beings. If we were to undertake such an effort to educate people, I think we could achieve our aim within ten years. Here, I’m not talking from a Buddhist point of view; I’m not talking from any religion’s point of view. I’m talking from a humanist point of view, a realistic point of view. If people’s minds are out of control, they’re going to use nuclear weapons. But irrespective of whether people are religious or non-religious, communist or non-communist, believers or non-believers, I believe every human being is capable of understanding the difference between harmful and non-harmful actions and the benefit of everybody’s being peaceful and happy. Since it’s a universal reality, we can educate people to see it. With respect to fear and worry, the Buddha’s solution is to analyze the object of fear and worry. If you do this correctly, you’ll be able to recognize that you’re seeing the object as fundamentally permanent, which has nothing to do with its reality. Look at it and ask yourself, “Is this really worth worrying about? Is worry a solution or not?” Analyze the object: is it permanent or changeable? As the great saints have said, “If it’s changeable, why worry? If it’s not, what’s the use of worrying?” When you’re afraid, analyze the object of your fears. Particularly when you’re emotionally disturbed and anxious, you’ll find that there’s a concept of concreteness in your mind, which causes you to project a concrete object externally. Neither concept has anything to do with reality. Buddhism asserts that the mind of fear and worry always either overestimates or underestimates its object and never sees its reality. If you can perceive the fundamental, universal reality of your object of fear and worry, it will become like a cloud—it comes; it goes. When you are overcome with worry, you sometimes say, “It’s always like this.” That’s not true. Things never stay the same; they always come and go—that’s the reality. Also, when you’re occupied by anxiety and fear, you might mean well, but you automatically have a tendency to generate hatred. Hatred has nothing to do with peace and happiness, does it? Buddhist psychology teaches that fear and anxiety tend to produce anger, aversion and hatred. You say you want peace and happiness but your very mental state causes hatred. It’s contradictory. People who demonstrate for peace and other causes have to watch out for this, but you have to judge for yourself how far you can go without generating hatred. Everybody’s different. Let’s say we’re out there campaigning for peace but then the president says something with which we disagree. Should we get angry? Should we hate the president? I don’t believe so; that would be a mistake. If our concern for peace and happiness makes us angry, there’s something wrong. The president is a human being. He, too, wants peace and happiness. At the bottom of his heart, he wants to be happy; he doesn’t want to be miserable. This is the universal reality. Therefore, all of us in the peace movement should make sure that we don’t hate any human being. This is the most important thing. When we demonstrate, we should be true to our word. Being a politician is not easy. Even being a wife or a husband is not easy. Most situations come with responsibility and obligation. We can look outside and blindly criticize people who work as administrators and so forth, but realistically, their position can be very difficult. To be successful, the peace movement should be selfless. If we who campaign for peace are coming from a place of selfishness, a basic concern for, “Me, me, me,” we have little chance of success. If, instead, we have a broad view based on concern for all human beings—understanding that everybody wants happiness and nobody wants to be miserable—and can educate others to see this, if we work towards this goal continuously, ultimately we’ll achieve it. There are many meditations you can do to eliminate anxiety. But meditation doesn’t mean going off to the mountains. You have the key to change your mind at any time, wherever you are. You can learn to switch your mind from emotion to peace and, each time you get distracted, gently bring it back to peace again. Practice this over and over again. You can do this; it’s human nature. You have to realize what you’re capable of. Check your own life, from the time you were born up to now—how many times have you changed your mind? Who changed it for you? Buddha didn’t change it. Jesus didn’t change it. Who changed your mind? Analyze this for yourself. That is the beauty of being human. We have the capacity for liberation within us; we come with that ability. If we utilize our energy and intelligence correctly, we can discover that liberation and happiness are already there, within us. The fundamental principle of Buddhism is not to kill. As Buddhists, this is our main obligation. I think most of you could promise never to kill another human being. That makes me very happy. We all have same aim; we think alike. Even though I’m a Tibetan monk, an uneducated mountain man, and you’re educated people from industrialized, capitalist societies, we have the same understanding. We don’t know each other, but we can still work together. That’s the most beautiful thing about being human. We can communicate with others. We should try to educate people all over the world to the point where everybody says, “For the rest of my life, I will never kill another human being.” If every human being on earth could agree to that, what would there be to worry about? Who could possibly be paranoid? In one way, the peace movement is beautiful, and if we act according to its ideas, there’ll be no more racism, no more nationalism. We’ll be equally concerned for all people. There’ll be no more fanatical religious concerns; we won’t even care if people are religious or not. Our only concern will be peace. All that will matter will be that people everywhere love and take care of each other. Who cares who’s communist or non-communist? What’s in the human heart is what’s important, not whether people are communist or capitalist. If we talk to each other, we can change the human heart. At present, we might be located in a non-communist country, but we shouldn’t project that communists want kill people who aren’t. That’s not true. People in communist countries are ladies and gentlemen, too. Like us, they want to be happy and desire not to be miserable. Therefore, together we can reach conclusions without involving the dogma of philosophy, the dogma of religion, the dogma of nationality, the dogma of racism; we can come together without any kind of dogma. That is beautiful. That is the beauty of the human being—to bring human unity and understanding without being blinded by categories. If you go to Russia and ask people, “Do you want to be killed by nuclear missiles?” they’re going to say No! For sure, they don’t want that to happen. Therefore, we have to educate people to understand the difference between what is beneficial for humanity and what is destructive—for the individual and for all. It’s simply a matter of education. Lord Buddha stressed the importance of generating loving kindness for all people irrespective of race, nationality, creed or anything else; he taught that all human beings and even animals were the object of loving kindness. This is the best guarantee against nuclear war, because each individual has to maintain control and take personal responsibility for the welfare of the all beings in the universe. Taking universal responsibility is the guarantee. If each individual doesn’t take personal responsibility for the welfare of all, it won’t work. To bring happiness and peace to earth, we have to eliminate every situation leading to hatred and anger. That means totally eradicating our own hatred and anger. We have to make our own lives peaceful and happy. This is the way to work for peace twenty-four hours a day. If our minds harbor destructive, angry thoughts, any talk of peace is just a joke. It’s merely artificial; there’s no guarantee. The only guarantee is to fertilize our minds with peace and loving kindness towards all; that’s the way we should do it. The question remains, is it possible to spread these ideas throughout the whole world? Can we get everybody in the world to agree to abandon the use of nuclear arms and not to kill any human being? Can you make that determination yourself? We can spread this philosophy or not? What do you think? We’re not using religion in this; we’re not using Buddha, we’re not using Christ, we’re not using religion or non-religion—we’re just concerned for the welfare of all human beings. What do you think? Do you think it’s possible to make this kind of program and reach that point reach or not? I’m not talking nationalistically or making any philosophic argument; I’m just talking about feeling secure, taking care of each other, loving each other, bringing peace and happiness to each other. It’s a very simple thing. Therefore, in our daily lives, each of us should all dedicate ourselves to bringing peace and happiness to all beings, and this determination itself is a powerful way of bringing peace and success into our lives. But this doesn’t mean not to act, either; to just be passive. But when you do act, act with wisdom and without selfishness, hatred or emotional fear. In that way, you will educate yourself and others. Don’t worry. Any talk of nuclear destruction of the earth is still speculation. It’s just a mental projection; it’s not yet reality. Therefore, relax and enjoy the rest of your life as much as possible. Be happy and peaceful, and don’t waste your time with pessimistic thoughts, fear or worry. Thank you so much.

**This foundational anxiety and fear makes extinction inevitable**

**Ikeda, 07,** Daisaku. Buddhist philosopher and president of Soka Gokkai International. “Restoring the Human Connection: The First Step to Global Peace,”http://www.sgi-uk.org/resources/PeaceProposal2007.pdf.

The challenge of preventing any further proliferation of nuclear weapons is 8 just such a trial in the quest for world peace, one that cannot be achieved if we are defeated by a sense of helplessness. The crucial element is to ensure that any struggle against evil is rooted firmly in a consciousness of the unity of the human family, something only gained through the mastery of our own inner contradictions. It is this kind of reconfiguration of our thinking that will make possible a skilled and restrained approach to the options of dialogue and pressure. The stronger our sense of connection as members of the human family, the more effectively we can reduce to an absolute minimum any application of the hard power of pressure, while making the greatest possible use of the soft power of dialogue. Tragically, the weighting in the case of Iraq has been exactly the reverse. The need for such a shift has been confirmed by many of the concerned thinkers I have met. Norman Cousins (1915–90), the writer known as the “conscience of America” with whom I published a dialogue, stated with dismay in his work Human Options: “The great failure of education—not just in the United States but throughout most of the world—is that it has made people tribe-conscious rather than species-conscious.”8 Similarly, when I met with Mohamed ElBaradei, director general of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), in November of last year, he declared powerfully: “… we continue to emphasize our differences instead of what we have in common. We continue to talk about ‘us’ versus ‘them.’ Only when we can start to talk about ‘us’ as including all of humanity will we truly be at peace….” In our correspondence, Joseph Rotblat posed the question, “Can we master the necessary arts of global security and loyalty to the human race?”9 Three months after writing these words to me, Dr. Rotblat passed away. I believe his choice to leave this most crucial matter in the form of an open question 9 was an expression of his optimism and his faith in humanity. When our thinking is reconfigured around loyalty to the human race—our sense of human solidarity—even the most implacable difficulties will not cause us to lapse into despair or condone the panicked use of force. It will be possible to escape the snares of such shortsighted thinking. We will be empowered to engage in the kind of persistent exertion that Max Weber viewed as the ideal of political action, and the door will be open to the formation of consensus and persuasion through dialogue. The function of anger When my mentor Josei Toda used the words “a devil incarnate, a fiend, a monster,” he was referring to a destructiveness inherent in human life. It is a function of this destructiveness to shred(s) our sense of human solidarity, sowing the seeds of mistrust and suspicion, conflict and hatred. Those who would use nuclear weapons capable of instantaneously killing tens of millions of people exhibit the most desperate symptoms of this pathology. They have lost all sense of the dignity of life, having fallen prey to their own inner demons. Buddhism classifies the underlying destructive impulses that give rise to such behavior as “the three poisons” (Jpn: san-doku) of greed, anger and ignorance. “The world of anger” can be thought of as the state of life of those in whom these forces have been directed outward toward others. Buddhism analyzes the inner state of human life in terms of the following ten categories, or “worlds”: Hell, Hunger, Animality, Anger, Humanity, Rapture, Learning, Realization, Bodhisattva and Buddhahood. Together these worlds constitute an interpenetrating functional whole, referred to as the inherent ten worlds. It is the wisdom and compassion of the world of Buddhahood that bring out the most positive aspect of each of the other 10 worlds. In the Buddhist scriptures we find the statement “anger can function for both good and evil,”10 indicating that just and righteous anger, the kind essential for countering evil, is the form of the world of anger that creates positive value. The anger that we must be on guard against is that which is undirected and unrestrained relative to the other nine worlds. In this case, anger is a rogue and renegade force, disrupting and destroying all in its path. In this form, the world of anger is a condition of “always seeking to surpass, unable to countenance inferiority, disparaging others and overvaluing oneself.”11 When in the world of anger, we are always engaged in invidious comparisons with others, always seeking to excel over them. The resulting distortions prevent us from perceiving the world accurately; we fall easily into conflict, locking horns with others at the slightest provocation. Under the sway of such anger, people can commit unimaginable acts of violence and bloodshed. Another Buddhist text portrays one in the world of anger as “84,000 yojanas tall, the waters of the four oceans coming only up to his knees.”12 A yojana was a measure of distance used in ancient India; there are various explanations as to what the specific distance may be, but “84,000 yojanas” represents an immeasurable enormity. This metaphor indicates how the self-perception of people in the life-state of anger expands and swells until the ocean deeps would only lap their knees. The inner distortions twisting the heart of someone in this state prevent them from seeing things in their true aspect or making correct judgments. Everything appears as a means or a tool to the fulfillment of egotistical desires and impulses. In inverse proportion to the scale of this inflated arrogance, the existence of others—people, cultures, nature—appears 11 infinitely small and insignificant. It becomes a matter of no concern to harm or even kill others trivialized in this way. It is this state of mind that would countenance the use of nuclear weapons; it can equally be seen in the psychology of those who would advocate the use of such hideously cruel weapons as napalm, or, more recently, depleted uranium and cluster bombs. People in such a state of life are blinded, not only to the horrific suffering their actions wreak but also to the value of human life itself. For the sake of human dignity, we must never succumb to the numbing dehumanization of the rampant world of anger. When the atomic bomb was dropped on the city of Hiroshima, not only military personnel but also many scientists were thrilled by the “success” of this new weapon. However, the consciences of genuinely great scientists were filled with anguish. Einstein greeted this news with an agonized cry of woe, while Rotblat told me he was completely overcome with hopelessness. Their feelings were no doubt intensely resonant with the sentiments that motivated Josei Toda to denounce nuclear weapons. When Toda spoke of “declawing” the demonic nature of nuclear weapons, he had in mind the struggle to prevent the inner forces of anger from disrupting the ten worlds and going on an unrestrained rampage. He was calling for the steady and painstaking work of correctly repositioning and reconfiguring the function of anger in an inner world where wisdom and harmony prevail. This is the true meaning of “declawing.” For SGI members in particular it is thus vital we remember that not only our specific activities for peace and culture but the movement for “human revolution” based on the daily endeavor to transform our lives from within is a consistent and essential aspect of the historic challenge of nuclear disarmament and abolition. 12 Unless we focus on this inner, personal dimension, we will find ourselves overwhelmed by the structural momentum of a technological civilization, which in a certain sense makes inevitable the birth of such demonic progeny as nuclear weapons.

**The alternative is to shed the ego --- this creates a realization of our unity with all living things.**

**Snauwaert 09** Dale, Fall 2009. Associate Professor of Educational Theory and Social Foundations of Education; Chair of the Department of Foundations of Education, University of Toledo. “The Ethics and Ontology of Cosmopolitanism: Education for a Shared Humanity,” Current Issues in Comparative Education 12.1, http://www.tc.edu/cice/Issues/12.01/PDFs/12\_01\_Complete\_Issue.pdf.

Cosmopolitans assert the existence of a duty of moral consideration to all human beings on the basis of a shared humanity. What is universal in, and definitive of, cosmopolitanism is the presupposition of the shared inherent dignity of humanity. As Martha Nussbaum states: [Human good can] be objective in the sense that it is justifiable by reference to reasons that do not derive merely from local traditions and practices, but rather from features of humanness that lie beneath all local traditions and are there to be seen whether or not they are in fact recognized in local traditions. (Perry, 1998, p. 68) If a shared humanity is presupposed, and if humanity is understood to possess an equal inherent value and dignity, then a shared humanity possesses a fundamental moral value. If the fundamental moral value of humanity is acknowledged, then a universal duty of moral consideration follows, for to deny moral consideration to any human being is to ignore (not recognize) their intrinsic value, and thereby, to violate their dignity. The duty of moral consideration in turn morally requires nations and peoples to conduct their relations in accordance with ethical principles that properly instantiate the intrinsic value and dignity of a shared humanity. If valid, the fundamental aims of the education of citizens should be based upon this imperative. In order to further explicate this cosmopolitanism perspective, the philosophy of one of history’s greatest cosmopolitans, Mohandas K. Gandhi, is explored below. Reflections on Gandhi’s Cosmopolitan Philosophy While most commentators focus on Gandhi’s conception and advocacy of nonviolence, it is generally recognized that his core philosophical beliefs regarding the essential unity of humanity and the universal applicability of nonviolence as a moral and political ideal places Gandhi in the cosmopolitan tradition as broadly understood (Iyer, [1973] 1983; Kumar Giri, 2006). At the core of Gandhi’s philosophy are the interdependent values of Satya (Truth) and Ahimsa (nonviolence). Gandhi’s approach to nonviolent social transformation, Satyagraha, is the actualization in action of these two values (Bondurant, 1965; Iyer, [1973] 1983; Naess, 1974). Gandhi’s Satya is multifaceted. Its most fundamental meaning pertains to Truth as self-realization. Satya is derived from sat, Being. Truth is Being; realizing in full awareness one’s authentic Being. Truth, in this sense, is the primary goal of life. Gandhi writes:

What I want to achieve . . . is self-realization . . . I live and move and have my being in pursuit of that goal. All that I do by way of speaking and writing, and all my ventures in the political field are directed to this same end. (Naess 1974, p. 35) Self-realization, for Gandhi, requires “shedding the ego,” ”reducing one self to zero” (cited in Naess 1974, p. 37). The ego per se is not the real self; it is a fabrication. This egoic self must be transcended. As the egoic self loosens and one becomes increasingly self-aware, one deepens the realization of one’s authentic being, and that being is experienced as unified with humanity and all living things. Scholars normally understand human identity in terms of personality, which is a socially constructed self-concept constituted by a complex network of identifications and object relations. This construction is what we normally refer to as the ego or self-identity. Our egoic self-identity is literally a construction, based upon psychological identifications (Almaas, 1986a, 1986b; Batchelor, 1983). From this perspective, the ego is a socially constructed entity, ultimately a fabrication of the discursive formations of culture; from this point of view, the self is exclusively egoic. This perspective has its origins in the claim that consciousness is solely intentional: the claim that consciousness is always consciousness of some object. From this presupposition, the socially constructed, discursive nature of the self is inferred. If consciousness is solely intentional, then the self is a construction, and, if the self is a construction, then it is always discursive – a prediscursive self cannot exist. It can be argued, however, that intentionality itself presupposes pre-intentional awareness. A distinction can be made between intentional consciousness and awareness. Intentional consciousness presupposes awareness that is always implicit in intentional consciousness. If intentional consciousness does not presuppose a pre-intentional awareness, if there is only consciousness of, then there is always a knower-known duality, and that duality leads to an infinite regress. To be conscious of an object X, one has to be conscious of one’s consciousness of X, and one would have to be conscious of one’s consciousness of one’s consciousness of X, and one would have to be conscious of one’s consciousness of one’s consciousness of one’s consciousness of X . . . ad infinitum¾reductio ad absurdum. Therefore, there must be implicit in intentional consciousness a level of awareness that is pre-intentional, pre-discursive, and non-positional (Forman, 1999). To be conscious of anything presupposes pre-intentional self-awareness, and being pre-intentional, awareness must be in turn pre-discursive and non-positional (Almaas, 1986a, 1986b; Aurobindo, 1989, 2001; Batchelor, 1983; Buber, 1970; Forman, 1999; Fromm, 1976). When the ego is shed, a pre-discursive, nonpositional self-awareness is revealed. One can be reflexively aware of one’s consciousness. Gandhi held that pre-discursive self-awareness, the core of our being, is unified and interdependent with all living things. He writes: “I believe in the essential unity of man and, for that matter, of all that lives (Naess 1974, p. 43).” In an ontological sense, Gandhi maintains that Satya, Truth, is selfrealization, a realization of one’s self-awareness as essentially unified with and thereby existing in solidarity with all human beings and with all living things. Pre-discursive self-awareness is experienced as non-positional, and, being non-positional, it is unbounded; it exists as a field of awareness that is interconnected with all sentient beings. This state is an experience and is only known experientially. Therefore, the assertion of a shared humanity is based upon a common level of being. Human intentional consciousness is expressed in a vast plurality of cultural expressions; implicit within this plurality, existing as its ground, is a shared level of awareness of being that unites us. From the perspective of ontological Truth, nonviolence follows from the unity and interdependence of humanity and life; violence damages all forms of life, including one’s self. Nonviolence uplifts all. Gandhi writes:

I do not believe . . . that an individual may gain spiritually and those who surround him suffer. I believe in advaita (non-duality), I believe in the essential unity of man and, for that matter, of all that lives. Therefore, I believe that if one man gains spiritually, the whole world gains with him and, if one man falls, the whole world falls to that extent. (Naess 1974, p. 43)

In this experience, one becomes aware of the interrelated and interdependent nature of being. On an existential level, there exists a fundamental interconnection between one’s self and other beings. As Buber suggests, “we live in the currents of universal reciprocity (Buber, 1970, p. 67).” From the perspective of this experience—and this is a direct experience—to harm the other is to harm one’s self. From the perspective of existential interconnection, nonviolence, the essence of morality, rests upon an awareness of our fundamental interconnection.

**Energy boom now -- that solves.**

**Johnson 12/2**, Tim, “Fuel boom key to U.S. superpower status?” http://www.santafenewmexican.com/news/fuel-boom-key-to-u-s-superpower-status/article\_82ae5b45-d49f-58d9-9832-8cae2d29b7f5.html)//DR. H

For the past 40 years, U.S. presidents have launched distant wars, allied with autocratic sheiks and dispatched naval fleets to protect sea lanes, all for the imperative of keeping foreign oil spigots flowing.

That imperative has now subsided. Rather suddenly, the center of gravity of global energy production has swung toward the Americas as shale oil and gas fields in North Dakota and Texas hum with activity. America is moving to the fore as the world’s largest producer of petroleum and natural gas. That change will reorder the globe in ways large and small.

U.S. experts say it will prolong the United States’ position as the predominant global superpower. Arab nations that shook the world with the 1973 oil embargo almost certainly will be weakened. Russia will find its power ebb as European nations find alternate suppliers for natural gas. New energy technologies will reorder the scales of global winners and losers.

#### Energy independence kills heg.

**Hulbert 8/19** – (2012, Matthew, Lead Analyst at European Energy Review and consultant to a number of governments, most recently as Senior Research Fellow, Netherlands Institute for International Relations, former Senior Research Fellow at ETH Zurich working on energy and political risk, MPhil in international relations from Cambridge University, “America Will Deeply Regret Its Fixation On Energy Independence,” <http://www.forbes.com/sites/matthewhulbert/2012/08/19/why-america-will-deeply-regret-us-energy-independence/4/>)

The U.S. energy independence debate is getting very tetchy of late. Seasoned energy experts are trading cheap blows, principally for sitting on opposite sides of the fence. Nobody doubts that U.S. energy output will keep growing, but **whether it ever amounts to full ‘independence’ is at best tenuous**. More importantly, **it spells total disaster for America’s role in the world**. No global oil role, **forget being a global hyper power**. Those days will be gone.

The allure of energy independence is a compelling story to tell. The U.S. can shut up shop, source all its energy from home shores, never having to step foot outside the Americas to get its energy fix. The U.S. will supposedly be able to boast 15 million barrels a day of liquids by 2020 from a raft of shale oil plays, with massive new oil plays feeding in from Canada in the North, inching production up to around 22mb/d. Unconventional resources are expected to explode from Latin America in the South. Brazil, Argentina, Venezuela will all see rapid supply growth, with Mexico having nothing short of a second energy revolution. Boil the numbers down, the Americas sits on 6.4 trillion unconventional barrels vs. 1.2 trillion conventional barrels across the Middle East. The U.S. will not only be the world’s largest single producer of crude; oil will flow from North to South across the America’s, not East to West across the globe. America can declare total energy independence, import dependency (already clipped to 45%) will be banished; the deficit will be fixed. Oil receipts will replenish the Federal Reserve, not OPEC states. Millions of hydrocarbon jobs will be created in the U.S. to boot. American oil, for American consumers, at American (WTI) prices. Whatever’s left over could be the swing supply for the rest of world, dictating how much everyone pays for a barrel of oil. **Epic stuff, no doubt**.

**Whether you believe all these numbers doesn’t really matter**. Few U.S. politicians (or analysts) pay much regard to depletion rates, cost uncertainties for viable extraction, local environmental risks, or contrasting production priorities across the Americas, not to mention the small fact that Asian NOCs have been making some of the main investments across North America. The fact that oil and gas only accounts for 1% of U.S. GDP, is also rather conveniently overlooked. **Energy independence is already being touted as a self-fulfilling prophecy playing out in real time today**, not as a gradual process of increments and change. This not only flies in the face of global hydrocarbon fundamentals that will see OPEC market share become more concentrated than ever over the next decade, (50% or more), it’s already creating serious geopolitical gaps across international energy markets.

That’s deeply problematic, precisely because supply side dynamics are looking more fragile than they have for a very long time. America has not only gone ‘missing in action’ to underwrite global supplies, it’s contributing to the **international malaise** by putting **perceived political interests ahead of global oil stability.** This comes in two forms, ‘passive’ and ‘aggressive’ from Washington – both built on the single idea that the U.S. can play a new geopolitical game thanks to energy independence beckoning just around the corner.

Independence: Passive And Active

Passive = Libya, where the U.S. made it abundantly clear to Europe that Tripoli was not considered a vital national security interest for the U.S., despite prices hitting $127/b. Britain and France were left picking up the pieces, with U.S. firepower providing back-up support, rather than frontline artillery. The chances of that happening had the U.S. not struck oil would have been unthinkable in the 2000s. Conversely, aggressive = Iran. The U.S. has decided that chimerical nuclear containment is a higher priority than collateral impacts Iranian sanctions have had on global oil markets. The conclusions are now chillingly clear. The U.S. will increasingly only act in its own perceived national security interests. As long as those interests went hand in hand with safeguarding international oil supplies, consumer state could all rest easy. But U.S. energy independence has torn up the script: We’ve entered a brave new world where Washington is not only unwilling to cover supply gaps through military / political action (Libya), and if needs be, is willing to put narrow interests above and beyond oil market stability (Iran).

No one should blame, or bemoan the U.S. for doing this. **It’s entirely up to the U.S. whichever path they chose to take**. You could even argue it’s exactly what Washington should be doing to create serious foreign policy optionality: pick and choose whatever it does where, when, and how for the rest of the world to fall back on. All fair enough, but the downside risk this presents to Washington has already been captured in the ‘Kuwait Question’: Would the U.S. take assertive action to secure some of the key producer states of the world, or would they now turn the cheek? We all know the U.S. is no longer dependent on Middle East supplies; it hasn’t been for a long time given it sources less than 15% of its oil from the sand. But we also know that the decision to underwrite MENA supplies is nothing to do with U.S. consumption – and everything to do with retaining a dominant global geopolitical role. Ensure that hydrocarbons globally flow to the East and West, and much else follows as the geo-economic and geo-political lynchpin of the world. Lose it, and you’ll be geopolitically downgraded quicker than credit analysts can get stuck into Greek debt. That’s before we consider where Gulf States decide to recycle their petrodollars in future. No security, no $? It’s certainly a question for the U.S. to ponder – not only in terms of who they are going to sell their Treasuries to, but what currency oil is priced in. Hence the bottom line for the U.S.; **Middle East energy isn’t about oil for America, it’s ultimately about power**. If the U.S. wasn’t part of the Gulf energy game, it would hold zero sway with Saudi, no powers of persuasion over Iranian nukes, no say in the Arab Awakening, or how Gulf Monarchies handle critical succession problems in future. Let alone shaping vested interests to promote and extend U.S. influence across the globe.

**No impact to the transition.**

**Ikenberry 08** – 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?” Jan/Feb 2008, Foreign Affairs)

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.

#### Heg isn’t key to liberal norms.

**Ikenberry 11** – (May/June issue of Foreign Affairs, G. John, PhD, Albert G. Milbank Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University in the Department of Politics and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, “The Future of the Liberal World Order,” http://www.foreignaffairs.com/

articles/67730/g-john-ikenberry/the-future-of-the-liberal-world-order?page=show)

For all these reasons, many observers have concluded that world politics is experiencing not just a changing of the guard but also a transition in the ideas and principles that underlie the global order. The journalist Gideon Rachman, for example, says that a cluster of liberal internationalist ideas -- such as faith in democratization, confidence in free markets, and the acceptability of U.S. military power -- are all being called into question. According to this worldview, the future of international order will be shaped above all by China, which will use its growing power and wealth to push world politics in an illiberal direction. Pointing out that China and other non-Western states have weathered the recent financial crisis better than their Western counterparts, pessimists argue that an authoritarian capitalist alternative to Western neoliberal ideas has already emerged. According to the scholar Stefan Halper, emerging-market states "are learning to combine market economics with traditional autocratic or semiautocratic politics in a process that signals an intellectual rejection of the Western economic model." Today's international order is not really American or Western--even if it initially appeared that way. But this panicked narrative misses a **deeper reality**: although the United States' position in the global system is changing, the liberal international order is alive and well. The struggle over international order today is not about fundamental principles. China and other emerging great powers do not want to contest the basic rules and principles of the liberal international order; they wish to gain more authority and leadership within it. Indeed, today's power transition represents not **the defeat of the liberal order but its ultimate ascendance**. Brazil, China, and India have all become more prosperous and capable by operating inside the existing international order -- benefiting from its rules, practices, and institutions, including the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the newly organized G-20. Their economic success and growing influence are tied to the liberal internationalist organization of world politics, and they have **deep interests in preserving** that system. In the meantime, alternatives to an open and rule-based order have yet to crystallize. Even though the last decade has brought remarkable upheavals in the global system -- the emergence of new powers, bitter disputes among Western allies over the United States' unipolar ambitions, and a global financial crisis and recession -- the liberal international order has no competitors. On the contrary, the rise of non-Western powers and the growth of economic and security interdependence are creating new constituencies for it. To be sure, as wealth and power become less concentrated in the United States' hands, the country will be less able to shape world politics. But the underlying foundations of the liberal international order will survive and **thrive**. Indeed, now may be the best time for the United States and its democratic partners to update the liberal order for a new era, ensuring that it continues to provide the benefits of security and prosperity that it has provided since the middle of the twentieth century.

**Resiliency checks.**

**Zakaria, 09** -PhD in pol sci from Harvard. Editor of Newsweek, BA from Yale, PhD in pol sci, Harvard. He serves on the board of Yale University, The Council on Foreign Relations, The Trilateral Commission, and Shakespeare and Company. Named "one of the 21 most important people of the 21st Century" (Fareed, The Secrets of Stability, 12 December 2009, http://www.fareedzakaria.com/articles/articles.html)

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 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.

**No risk of nuclear terror.**

**Chapman 12** (Stephen, editorial writer for Chicago Tribune, “CHAPMAN: Nuclear terrorism unlikely,” May 22, http://www.oaoa.com/articles/chapman-87719-nuclear-terrorism.html)

A layperson may figure it’s only a matter of time before the unimaginable comes to pass. Harvard’s Graham Allison, in his book “Nuclear Terrorism,” concludes, “On the current course, nuclear terrorism is inevitable.” But remember: After Sept. 11, 2001, we all thought more attacks were a certainty. Yet al-Qaida and its ideological kin have proved unable to mount a second strike. Given their inability to do something simple — say, shoot up a shopping mall or set off a truck bomb — it’s reasonable to ask whether they have a chance at something much more ambitious. Far from being plausible, argued Ohio State University professor John Mueller in a presentation at the University of Chicago, “the likelihood that a terrorist group will come up with an atomic bomb seems to be vanishingly small.” The events required to make that happen comprise a multitude of Herculean tasks. First, a terrorist group has to get a bomb or fissile material, perhaps from Russia’s inventory of decommissioned warheads. If that were easy, one would have already gone missing. Besides, those devices are probably no longer a danger, since weapons that are not maintained quickly become what one expert calls “radioactive scrap metal.” If terrorists were able to steal a Pakistani bomb, they would still have to defeat the arming codes and other safeguards designed to prevent unauthorized use. As for Iran, no nuclear state has ever given a bomb to an ally — for reasons even the Iranians can grasp. Stealing some 100 pounds of bomb fuel would require help from rogue individuals inside some government who are prepared to jeopardize their own lives. Then comes the task of building a bomb. It’s not something you can gin up with spare parts and power tools in your garage. It requires millions of dollars, a safe haven and advanced equipment — plus people with specialized skills, lots of time and a willingness to die for the cause. Assuming the jihadists vault over those Himalayas, they would have to deliver the weapon onto American soil. Sure, drug smugglers bring in contraband all the time — but seeking their help would confront the plotters with possible exposure or extortion. This, like every other step in the entire process, means expanding the circle of people who know what’s going on, multiplying the chance someone will blab, back out or screw up. That has heartening implications. If al-Qaida embarks on the project, it has only a minuscule chance of seeing it bear fruit. Given the formidable odds, it probably won’t bother. None of this means we should stop trying to minimize the risk by securing nuclear stockpiles, monitoring terrorist communications and improving port screening. But it offers good reason to think that in this war, it appears, the worst eventuality is one that will never happen.

**Pemex instability’s inevitable.**

**Martin and Longmire 11** – Jeremy Martin is Director of the Energy Program at the Institute of the Americas, Sylvia Longmire is a Mexico Security Expert & President, Longmire Consulting (Jeremy Martin and Sylvia Longmire, Journal of Energy Security, “The Perilous Intersection of Mexico’s Drug War & Pemex”, March 22, 2011, http://www.borderlandbeat.com/2011/03/perilous-intersection-of-mexicos-drug.html) // CB

Pemex exposed and impacted

As discussed previously, oil theft from Pemex pipelines, money laundering by way of service stations, and, worst of all, provocative kidnappings of the company’s executives and those of service companies working with the state firm, are all on the rise.

Unofficial figures place thefts from the Pemex network at roughly $2 billion annually. And security experts point to this as an important source of revenue for drug cartels

# Block

**That outweighs -- the absence of a mind-independent reality means there is zero impact to death.**

**Lanza 11** Robert, 1/20/2011. Vice President of Research and Scientific Development at Advanced Cell Technology and a professor at Wake Forest University School of Medicine. “Five Reasons You Won't Die,” Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-lanza/5-reasons-you-wont-die\_b\_810936.html.

We've been taught we're just a collection of cells, and that we die when our bodies wear out. End of story. I've written textbooks showing how cells can be engineered into virtually all the tissues and organs of the human body. But a long list of scientific experiments suggests our belief in death is based on a false premise, that the world exists independent of us − the great observer. Here are five reasons you won't die. Reason One. You're not an object, you're a special being. According to biocentrism, nothing could exist without consciousness. Remember you can't see through the bone surrounding your brain. Space and time aren't objects, but rather the tools our mind uses to weave everything together. "It will remain remarkable," said Eugene Wigner, who won the Nobel Prize in Physics in 1963 "in whatever way our future concepts may develop, that the very study of the external world led to the conclusion that the content of the consciousness is an ultimate reality." Consider the uncertainty principle, one of the most famous and important aspects of quantum mechanics. Experiments confirm it's built into the fabric of reality, but it only makes sense from a biocentric perspective. If there's really a world out there with particles just bouncing around, then we should be able to measure all their properties. But we can't. Why should it matter to a particle what you decide to measure? Consider the double-slit experiment: if one "watches" a subatomic particle or a bit of light pass through slits on a barrier, it behaves like a particle and creates solid-looking hits behind the individual slits on the final barrier that measures the impacts. Like a tiny bullet, it logically passes through one or the other hole. But if the scientists do not observe the trajectory of the particle, then it exhibits the behavior of waves that allow it pass through both holes at the same time. Why does our observation change what happens? Answer: Because reality is a process that requires our consciousness. The two-slit experiment is an example of quantum effects, but experiments involving Buckyballs and KHCO3 crystals show that observer-dependent behavior extends into the world of ordinary human-scale objects. In fact, researchers recently showed (Nature 2009) that pairs of ions could be coaxed to entangle so their physical properties remained bound together even when separated by large distances, as if there was no space or time between them. Why? Because space and time aren't hard, cold objects. They're merely tools of our understanding. Death doesn't exist in a timeless, spaceless world. After the death of his old friend, Albert Einstein said "Now Besso has departed from this strange world a little ahead of me. That means nothing. People like us...know that the distinction between past, present and future is only a stubbornly persistent illusion." In truth, your mind transcends space and time. Reason Two. Conservation of energy is a fundamental axiom of science. The first law of thermodynamics states that energy can't be created or destroyed. It can only change forms. Although bodies self-destruct, the "me'' feeling is just a 20-watt cloud of energy in your head. But this energy doesn't go away at death. A few years ago scientists showed they could retroactively change something that happened in the past. Particles had to "decide" how to behave when they passed a fork in an apparatus. Later on, the experimenter could flip a switch. The results showed that what the observer decided at that point determined how the particle behaved at the fork in the past. Think of the 20-watts of energy as simply powering a projector. Whether you flip a switch in an experiment on or off, it's still the same battery responsible for the projection. Like in the two-slit experiment, you collapse physical reality. At death, this energy doesn't just dissipate into the environment as the old mechanical worldview suggests. It has no reality independent of you. As Einstein's esteemed colleague John Wheeler stated "No phenomenon is a real phenomenon until it is an observed phenomenon." Each person creates their own sphere of reality - we carry space and time around with us like turtles with shells. Thus, there is no absolute self-existing matrix in which energy just dissipates. Reason Three. Although we generally reject parallel universes as fiction, there's more than a morsel of scientific truth to this genre. A well-known aspect of quantum physics is that observations can't be predicted absolutely. Instead, there's a range of possible observations each with a different probability. One mainstream explanation is the 'many-worlds' interpretation, which states that each of these possible observations corresponds to a different universe (the 'multiverse'). There are an infinite number of universes (including our universe), which together comprise all of physical reality. Everything that can possibly happen occurs in some universe. Death doesn't exist in any real sense in these scenarios. All possible universes exist simultaneously, regardless of what happens in any of them. Like flipping the switch in the experiment above, you're the agent who experiences them. Reason Four. You will live on through your children, friends, and all who you touch during your life, not only as part of them, but through the histories you collapse with every action you take. "According to quantum physics," said theoretical physicists Stephen Hawking and Leonard Mlodinow, "the past, like the future, is indefinite and exists only as a spectrum of possibilities." There's more uncertainty in bio-physical systems than anyone ever imagined. Reality isn't fully determined until we actually investigate (like in the Schrödinger's cat experiment). There are whole areas of history you determine during your life. When you interact with someone, you collapse more and more reality (that is, the spatio-temporal events that define your consciousness). When you're gone, your presence will continue like a ghost puppeteer in the universes of those you know. Reason Five. It's not an accident that you happen to have the fortune of being alive now on the top of all infinity. Although it could be a one-in-a-jillion chance, perhaps it's not just dumb luck, but rather must be that way. While you'll eventually exit this reality, you, the observer, will forever continue to collapse more and more 'nows.' Your consciousness will always be in the present -- balanced between the infinite past and the indefinite future -- moving intermittently between realities along the edge of time, having new adventures and meeting new (and rejoining old) friends.

**Only the alternative’s acceptance of the randomness of events in life solves the 1ACs impact -- the AFF fails because it assumes a linear world.**

**Kiessel, 09**, (Amanda Kiessel, Dr. Amanda Kiessel is Program Director at Sewalanka Foundation, a Sri Lankan non-profit development organization that focuses on increasing the capacity of rural communities to identify and address their own needs PhD in Environmental Studies and a background in sustainable agriculture and organizational development, Towards Global Transformation, proceedings of the third international conference on gross national happiness, Oct. 7, 2009, “Beyond the Linear Logic of Project Aid Alternative: Understandings of Participation and Community Vitality”, pgs. 183-198)//LOH

Implications for development interventions if society is seen as a dynamic. non-linear system, where change emerges from local-level interactions and planned interventions produce unpredictable outcomes, what does this mean for development and other attempts to direct social change? It does not mean that we are forced resign ourselves to drifting along through history and accepting the undesirable circumstances that emerge through the results of our actions like massive inequity species loss hunger pollution, and war. It means that we need to **re-evaluate** how we think about change in a changing world. According to one of the researchers investigating complex adaptive systems: It’s like a kaleidoscope: the world is a matter of patterns that change, that partly repeat, but never quite repeat, that are always new and different. We are a part of this thing that is never changing and always changing. If you think that you’re a steamboat and can go up the river, you’re kidding yourself. Actually, you’re just the captain of a paper boat drifting down the river. If you try to resist you are not going to get anywhere. On the other hand. if you quietly observe the flow, realizing that you’re part of it, realizing that the now is ever-changing and leading to new complexities, then every so often you can stick an oar onto the river and punt yourself from one eddy to another.. .it means that you try to see reality for what it is, and realize that the game you are in keeps changing, so It’s up to you to figure out the current rules of the game as it’s being played...YOU observe. And where you can make an effective move you make a move. A complexity paradigm is call for a more strategic approach to directed social change a process of constantly observing and analyzing the system identifying strategic spaces for action and channeling our energy and resources more effectively. According Harsha Navatne the Chajiiaïi of Sewalailka Fotlndarjorì to follow a linear pre-determined plan can restrict our act effectively. Development is a balancing act, an art, and the exact path can’t be predicted. Once, to explain this point, he took out a blank sheet of paper and made a ‘hark at the top this is where we want to go, but we are here, he said pointing, of the page. He then drew lines across page. We cannot go directly. There are many obstacles in the way. There are many constraints and the and the situation is constantly changing. If we try to go in a straight line according to our ideology and theories we will get “**stuck**”. He drew a winding line from the bottom of the page to the top that bypassed all the ‘obstacles’. ‘You have to find a creative way to reach your goal you have to keep your eves focused on where you are trying to go. but you have to understand that to reach that place you may have to try many different paths. You have to be flexible and creative. Pre-determined project plans confine genuine participation and limit the ability of the ‘participants’ to adapt local conditions, learn from experience and adjust to changing circumstances.

**Ontology is a sequencing issue -- the permutation fails and is an independent reason to vote NEG.**

**Jackson, 10** Patrick Thaddeus. Associate Professor of International Relations in the School of International Service at the American University in Washington, DC. “The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations: Philosophy of Science and its Implications for the Study of World Politics,” p 41-2.

**Ontological commitments**, whether philosophical or scientific, logically **precede substantive claims,** and serve as the often-unacknowledged basis on which empirical claims are founded. In this sense, ontological commitments are “foundational”—not in the sense that they provide unshakable grounds that universally guarantee the validity of the claims that are founded on them, but “foundational” in the sense that they provide the conditions of intelligibility for those claims. In that way, ontological commitments are world-disclosing, since they make a particular kind of tangible world available to a researcher (Habermas 1990, 321). A claim such as “democratic states do not go to war with one another” implicitly makes a number of ontological presuppositions. The claim makes scientific-ontological presuppositions that a state’s “democracy-ness” is a conceptually separable attribute of that state and most likely also presupposes that a state’s standing as a democracy is something that is visible to external scholarly observers and specifiable in an abstract fashion.1 The claim also makes philosophical-ontological presuppositions, although these are somewhat further removed from the individual claim and pertain more to the overall intellectual context within which the claim make sense; hence one needs to know something about the broader body of scholarly literature within which a claim has standing in order to explicate the philosophical-ontological commitments that it tacitly presumes. The academic study of the democratic peace has been almost completely dominated by a neopositivist methodology. Neopositivism, although neutral with respect to the truth-value of specific empirical propositions, sets the contours of the research design within which claims about the democratic peace—and, quite frankly, claims about many of the other empirical phenomena regularly studied within academic IR—are evaluated. Before scholars can engage in debates about whether democratic peace is best measured and assessed as a dyadic of as a monadic phenomenon (for example, Rousseau et al. 1996), it is first necessary for those scholars to agree on some basic methodological principles, such as the notion that a causal connection shows itself in systematic cross-case correlations between specific factors (in this case, variable attributes such as “being a democracy” and “going to war with another democracy”), and the notion that knowledge is constructed through the successive proposing and testing of hypothetical guesses about the character of the world. The fact that these assumptions are so widely shared, both within the democratic peace research community and within the field of IR more generally, does not make them any less philosophical—or any less philosophically contentious. Hypothesis testing and covariation-causality2 are more or less direct consequences of the pair of philosophical-ontological commitments on which neopositivism stands: mind-world dualism and phenomenalism. Mind-world dualism enables hypothesis testing, inasmuch as testing a hypothetical guess to see whether it corresponds to the world makes little sense in the absence of a mind-independent world against which to test the hypothesis. Phenomenalism enables covariation-causality, since the limitation of knowledge to those aspects of the world that can be empirically grasped and directly experienced implies that the only confidence that observers can have about a causal relationship—which must be inferred rather than abduced or counterfactually ideal-typified—must be founded on its systematicity.3 In the absence of these philosophical-ontological commitments, testing hypotheses in order to arrive at reliable statements about robust correlations would make little sense, and if we were interested in knowing about how democracy was connected to questions of war and peace, we would have to engage in some other kinds of knowledge-production procedures.

**Education -- their framework silences alternate education that causes policy failure -- only internal self-transformation allows effective political action.**

**Zajonc 6 –** Professor of physics at Amherst College

(Arthur, “Contemplative and Transformative Pedagogy,” Kosmos Journal 1.1, <http://www.arthurzajonc.org/uploads/Contemplative_Pedagogy%20Kosmos.pdf)//BB>

I approach the question of shaping worldviews as an educator and as one who, like so many, is moved by widespread violence and global economic inequities. What is it about worldviews that results in the identity politics of Iraq where Shiites, Sunnis, and Kurds all act along ethnic and religious lines, or in Darfur where issues of identity cut deeper, leading to Arabs perpetrating mass killing and rape against their Muslim brothers and sisters who are 'black Africans' from non-Arab tribes? What is it about worldviews that leads to a large and growing divide between the rich and the poor? In the face of increasing per capita GDP, the global median income is decreasing, and 100 million more are in poverty today than ten years ago.1 What can I as an educator offer in the face of these tragic realities of today's world? To offer an alternative or 'better' worldview is to no avail. In fact, efforts to promote that better viewpoint may initiate or aggravate conflict. In this article I advance a view of the human being in which the individual develops the capacity to move among worldviews, transcending particular identities while simultaneously honoring each of them. Even more, we can learn to live the complexity of diverse identities that are in truth everpresent in us as well as in the world. In reality, the interconnectedness of the world has its reflection in the connections among the diverse aspects of ourselves. When we find peace among the component parts of our own psyche, then we will possess the inner resources to make peace in a multicultural society. Only in this way will the crises I have mentioned be addressed at their roots. I see education—formal and informal—as the sole means of developing this remarkable human capacity for interior harmony, which in the end is the capacity for freedom and love. The Function of Frames The content of education is infinite in extent. Every day more information is available, new research is published, political changes occur, and businesses collapse. All of these demand our attention. Education is largely comprised of acquiring and organizing such information, and for this purpose students are taught the skills needed to assimilate and transmit information through reading, writing, and mathematics. But such simple input-output functions are but one dimension of education. Something more is needed to convert information into meaningful knowledge. Surrounding and supporting the information we receive is the 'form' or structure of our cognitive and emotional life that goes largely unobserved. To understand how information becomes meaningful, we must turn our attention to this hidden container or 'frame of reference,' as Jack Mezirow termed it.2 A frame of reference is a way of knowing or making meaning of the world. Enormous quantities of sensorial and mental data stream into human consciousness, but somehow that stream is brought into a coherent meaningful whole. At first sight it may seem that such meaning-making is an entirely natural and universal process, and to some degree it certainly is. Evolution has incorporated reflexes and drives deep into the human psyche. But the way we make sense of the world is also conditioned profoundly by societal forces, among them education. That is to say, we are socialized into a worldview that operates largely unconsciously and behind the scenes, but which affects the way we understand what we see, hear, and feel. According to the Leo Apostel Centre for Interdisciplinary Studies in Belgium, "A worldview is a map that people use to orient and explain the world, and from which they evaluate and act, and put forward prognoses and visions of the future." In the course of a lifetime we may shed one worldview and adopt another. In other words, we can change the structure that makes meaning for us. Thus while worldviews can be understood as deep cognitive structures, they are not immutable. The solutions to Darfur and economic inequality (among many other problems) will ultimately **not be found** through more information or better foreign aid programs, but only here at the level where information marries with values to become meaning. Human action flows from this source, not from data alone. An **education** that would reach beyond information must **work deeper**; it will need to **transform the very container of consciousness**, make it more supple and complex. For this, we educators need pedagogical 2 tools other than those optimized for information transfer. At its most advanced stage, we will need to help our students and ourselves to create a dynamic cognitive framework that can challenge established intellectual boundaries, and even sustain the conflicting values and viewpoints that comprise our planetary human community. Challenging Conventional Divisions In recent years I have spent time with members of the Native American Academy, a group largely comprised of academics who are also Native Americans. In our meetings we have explored the character of Native knowledge systems and research methods in comparison to those of orthodox Western science. From the first, the differences were marked. The place of our meeting was of special consequence, Chaco Canyon. It is the site of an ancient indigenous settlement whose remaining structures are clearly aligned according to a detailed astronomical knowledge. Following a long drive we turned onto the approach road, stopping in the middle of nowhere to make a small offering of bee pollen and tobacco. The first evening included a long ceremony performed by a knowledge-keeper from the local Native population, which concluded with a sensitive presentation of the problems we were likely to encounter in our endeavors. The sacred and the secular so seamlessly blended in the indigenous mind contrasts strongly with the conventional division between science and spirituality in the modern West. In the Western worldview, science is often defined in opposition to spirituality. My work with Native American colleagues challenges that presupposition at its root. Our time is one in which such unreflective assumptions must increasingly be challenged. Last year I was seated among over 10,000 neuroscientists listening to the fourteenth Dalai Lama address them concerning the interaction between Buddhist philosophers and Western scientists. The occasion was the annual meeting of the Society for Neuroscience, and the Dalai Lama was the keynote speaker because of his groundbreaking collaborative work to bridge the traditional cultural divide between science and the contemplative traditions. Because of his openness and that of a growing number of scientists, Buddhist meditative insights have been joined to scientific research in ways that are very fruitful for the fields of cognitive science and psychology.3 This is a second example in which traditional divisions have been challenged with fruitful consequences. Contemplative Pedagogy One of the **most powerful** transformative **intervention**s developed by humanity is contemplative practice or **meditation**. It has been specifically designed to move human cognition from a delusory view of reality to a true one: that is, to one in which the profound interconnectedness of reality is directly perceived. Global conflict has its deep source in the privileging of worldviews, in the reification of our particular understanding and the objectification of the other. Such ways of seeing our world are, at root, dysfunctional and divisive. Contemplative practice works on the human psyche to shape attention into a far suppler instrument, one that can appreciate a wide range of worldviews and even sustain the paradoxes of life, ultimately drawing life's complexity into a gentle, non-judgmental awareness. The usefulness of secular contemplative practice is being increasingly appreciated by educators at hundreds of North American universities and colleges. For example, in collaboration with The Center for Contemplative Mind in Society, the American Council of Learned Societies has granted 120 Contemplative Practice Fellowships to professors over the last ten years, supporting them in designing courses that include contemplative practice as a pedagogical strategy.4 At conferences and summer schools at Columbia University and Amherst College and elsewhere, professors have gathered to share their experiences in the emerging area of contemplative pedagogy. Their efforts range from simple silence at the start of class to exercises that school attention; and most recently, to innovative contemplative practices that relate directly to course content. The 2005 Columbia Conference focused specifically on the role of contemplative practices in "Making Peace in Ourselves and Peace in the World." Courses are offered that range from theater to economics, from philosophy to cosmology, in which university teachers are experimenting with a wide range of contemplative exercises, thus creating a new academic pedagogy. I have become convinced that contemplation 3 benefits both students and faculty, and that secular contemplative practices should assume a significant place on our educational agenda. Contemplative practices fall into two major classes, those that school cognition and those that cultivate compassion. We are well aware that our observation and thinking require training, but we often neglect the cultivation of our capacity for love. In his letters to a young poet, Rainer Maria Rilke wrote, "For one human being to love another, that is perhaps the most difficult of all our tasks, the ultimate, the last test and proof, the work for which all other work is but a preparation. For this reason young people, who are beginners in everything, cannot yet know love, they have to learn it. With their whole being, with all their forces, gathered close about their lonely, timid, upwardbeating heart, they must learn to love." 5 We are well-practiced at educating the mind for critical reasoning, critical writing, and critical speaking as well as for scientific and quantitative analysis. But is this sufficient? In a world beset with conflicts, internal as well as external, isn't it of equal if not greater importance to balance the sharpening of our intellects with the systematic cultivation of our hearts? We must, indeed, learn to love. Educators should join with their students to undertake this most difficult task. Thus true education entails a transformation of the human being that, as Goethe said, "is so great that I never would have believed it possible." This transformation results in the human capacity to live the worldviews of others, and even further to sustain in our mind and heart the contradictions that are an inevitable part of engaging the beautiful variety of cultures, religions, and races that populate this planet. We can sustain the complexities of the world because we have learned to honor and embrace the complex, conflicting components of ourselves. Our inner accomplishments, achieved through contemplative education, translate into outer capacities for peace-building. From there it is a short distance to the perception of interconnectedness and the enduring love for others, especially for those different from us. We are increasingly becoming a world populated by solitudes. When Rilke declares that the highest expression of love is to "stand guard over and protect the solitude of the other," he is expressing his respect for and even devotion to the uniqueness of every person and group. If, however, we are to avoid social atomization or the fundamentalist reaction to this tendency, we will need to learn to love across the chasms that divide us. Only a profoundly contemplative and transformative education has the power to nurture the vibrant, diverse civilization that should be our global future. As Maria Montessori wrote, "Preventing conflicts is the work of politics; establishing peace is the work of education."6

**Normative Debate is bad -- their focus on governmental politics cedes agency and decimates decisionmaking skills.**

**Kappeler 95** – (Susanne is an associate professor at al-akhawayn university, “the will to violence: the politics of personal behavior”, pg. 10-11, MT)

`We are the war' does not mean that the responsibility for a war is shared collectively and diffusely by an entire society - which would be equivalent to exonerating warlords and politicians and profiteers or, as Ulrich Beck says, upholding the notion of `collective irresponsibility', where people are no longer held responsible for their actions, and where the conception of universal responsibility becomes the equival­ent of a universal acquittal.' On the contrary, the object is precisely to analyse the specific and differential responsibility of everyone in their diverse situations. Decisions to unleash a war are indeed taken at particular levels of power by those in a position to make them and to command such collective action. We need to hold them clearly responsible for their decisions and actions without lessening theirs by any collective `assumption' of responsibility. Yet our habit of focusing on the stage where the major dramas of power take place tends to obscure our sight in relation to our own sphere of competence, our own power and our own responsibility - leading to the well-known illusion of our apparent `powerlessness’ and its accompanying phe­nomenon, our so-called political disillusionment. Single citizens - even more so those of other nations - have come to feel secure in their obvious non-responsibility for such large-scale political events as, say, the wars in Croatia and Bosnia-Hercegovina or Somalia - since the decisions for such events are always made elsewhere. Yet our insight that indeed we are not responsible for the decisions of a Serbian general or a Croatian president tends to mislead us into thinking that therefore we have no responsibility at all, not even for forming our own judgement, and thus into underrating the respons­ibility we do have within our own sphere of action. In particular, it seems to absolve us from having to try to see any relation between our own actions and those events, or to recognize the connections between those political decisions and our own personal decisions. It not only shows that we participate in what Beck calls `organized irresponsibility', upholding the apparent lack of connection between bureaucratically, institutionally, nationally and also individually or­ganized separate competences. It also proves the phenomenal and unquestioned alliance of our personal thinking with the thinking of the major powermongers: For we tend to think that we cannot `do' anything, say, about a war, because we deem ourselves to be in the wrong situation; because we are not where the major decisions are made. Which is why many of those not yet entirely disillusioned with politics tend to engage in a form of mental deputy politics, in the style of `What would I do if I were the general, the prime minister, the president, the foreign minister or the minister of defence?' Since we seem to regard their mega spheres of action as the only worthwhile and truly effective ones, and since our political analyses tend to dwell there first of all, any question of what I would do if I were indeed myself tends to peter out in the comparative insignificance of having what is perceived as `virtually no possibilities': what *I could* do seems petty and futile. For my own action I obviously desire the range of action of a general, a prime minister, or a General Secretary of the UN - finding expression in ever more prevalent formulations like `I want to stop this war', `I want military intervention', `I want to stop this backlash', or `I want a moral revolution." 'We are this war', however, even if we do not command the troops or participate in so-called peace talks, namely as Drakulic says, in our `non-comprehension’: our willed refusal to feel responsible for our own thinking and for working out our own understanding, preferring innocently to drift along the ideological current of prefabricated arguments or less than innocently taking advantage of the advantages these offer. And we `are' the war in our `unconscious cruelty towards you', our tolerance of the `fact that you have a yellow form for refugees and I don't' - our readiness, in other words, to build ident­ities, one for ourselves and one for refugees, one of our own and one for the `others'. We share in the responsibility for this war and its violence in the way we let them grow inside us, that is, in the way we shape `our feelings, our relationships, our values' according to the structures and the values of war and violence.

**Owen concedes that shapes policies.**

**Owen 02 –** (David, Reader of Political Theory at the Univ. of Southampton, Millennium, Vol 31, No 3, Sage)

*\*Owen concludes NEG -- he really says that debates concerning ontology play a central role in IR because ontology is a crucial feature of social sciences which explain overall IR theories -- Owen claims certainty in the importance of philosophical reflection and its role in shaping international commitments.*

Commenting on the ‘philosophical turn’ in IR, Wæver remarks that ‘[a] frenzy for words like “epistemology” and “ontology” often signals this philosophical turn’, although he goes on to comment that these terms are often used loosely.4 However, loosely deployed or not, it is clear that **debates concerning ontology** and epistemology **play a central role in** the contemporary **IR** theory wars. In one respect, this is unsurprising since it is a characteristic feature of the social sciences that periods of disciplinary disorientation involve recourse to reflection on the philosophical commitments of different theoretical approaches, and there is **no doubt** that such reflection can play a valuable role in making explicit the commitments that characterise (and help individuate) diverse theoretical positions. Yet, such a philosophical turn is not without its dangers and I will briefly mention three before turning to consider a confusion that has, I will suggest, helped to promote the IR theory wars by motivating this philosophical turn.

**Science -- MRI studies prove the transformation fundamentally changes brain functions and generates an experience of unity with the world.**

**Ritskes et al, 03** Rients. MRI Research Centre, Aarhus University Hospital Skejby, Denmark, Biomedical Laboratory University of Southern Denmark, and Institute of Psychology University of Aarhus. “MRI Scanning During Zen Meditation: The Picture of Enlightenment,” Constructivism in the Human Sciences 8.1, <http://yogaterapist.net/files/hersenscan.pdf>.

\*

This study demonstrates, consistent with earlier findings, that a higher activity in the **g**yrus **f**rontalis **m**edius arises during the initial phase of Zen meditation. The gyrus frontalis medius is part of the front lobe; this area, sometimes called the Attention Association area, is held responsible for more complex human feelings. Austin concludes, based on studies of people with frontal lobe lesions, that increased activity in this area is thought to be associated with enhanced insights and attentiveness, heightened interests, sharper mental focusing, and deepened emotional resonances. IN the famous case report on Phineas Gage, it is reported that the gyrus frontalis medius in the prefrontal cortex was damaged due to an accident. Consequently, he lost his personality, developed blunted emotions and lost social interest. Presumably, this outcome can be summarized as a loss of compassion. Other research has shown that electrical stimulation of the prefrontal cortex is associated with positive feelings. This study reports that one-quarter of the group that received electrical stimulation of this area of the brain reported positive changes in the mood as well. Additionally, a PET-study has demonstrated decreased frontal-lobe activity in murderers (there may after all have been a good scientific reason for the New York State prison to have started a Zen meditation group in 1984 – an example that is followed by many prisons world wide). Increased activity in the basal ganglia during meditation conforms to what one would expect during certain Zen practices. For example, the tea-ceremony and Zen-archery are just two examples of rituals that need optimal use of the main functions of the basal ganglia, namely the making of precisely controlled movements. Moreover, activation of the basal ganglia appears to be stimulated by counting the breadth, thereby possibly resulting in improved control of movements by the conscious breathing process. Decreased activity in the gyrus occipitalis superior and the anterior cingulated suggests that, during meditation, there is less interference of our will and less awareness of where we are. In summary, current research is suggestive of a state of mind, which may have resemblances to the experience of an enlightenment state, where time and place limits have disappeared, and a great feeling of love/unity is experienced.

**The 1ACs constant obsession with death revokes any fear of it -- turns the case.**

**Harder 93** Heather Anne Harder, Ph.D. in Education, 1993

(Exploring Life's Last Frontier, http://www.innerself.com/Miscellaneous/afraid\_dying.htm)

One of the most important things to know is that you can prepare now for death and you can even enjoy the preparation process. Preparing for death can enrich your living experiences. Once you can look death in the eye and feel nothing but pleasant, yet mild, anticipation, then life becomes much more enjoyable.

This epitaph taken from a headstone in Ashby, Massachusetts, describes the basic truth.

Remember, friends, as you pass by,

as you are now, so once was I.

As I am now, so you must be.

Prepare yourself to follow me.

You are well-advised to prepare yourself for death. But whether you are ready or not, when your self-determined hour arrives you will pass to the next dimension. Your hour is determined by you and your council -- not the little you that operates in the conscious mind, but the greater You that operates in harmony with Divine Source. This higher self, as it is often referred to, maintains the direct connection to the Divine Source.

A little preparation can make the death experience more pleasant and thus more peaceful for you as well as those you leave behind. Here are some suggestions for this preparation.

TALKING ABOUT DEATH

Allow yourself to talk about death as a part of life. I assure you, you do not bring death closer to you by talking about it, and you may make yourself more comfortable with the concept. By avoiding the topic you shroud it in mystery and shame. It becomes one of those topics that we don't talk about in polite society.

Upon death you will create your own death experience based on what you believe. Therefore, the clearer you are about what you want and expect to happen, the better off you will be. Read and examine the near-death experiences of others. Discuss with friends what you read. Do these books and articles describe a hell? Do you want one? Play with the concepts and words involved with death. This allows you and others to adjust to a death reality. Talking about your thoughts and concepts helps you to clarify your own views. It forces you to synthesize and articulate your reality. It is at this point that you are able to revise or adjust your own faulty thinking. Even if you do not, at first, have an accurate reality of death, the process of open forum allows you to open to a variety of possibilities.

While Mom was in the hospital, she and I had an opportunity to discuss death. Although she was very confused and scared of death, she listened to my views and shared her own. She talked about what she wanted to happen (and how) if she died. At this point no one believed that she would be dead in less than two months. The conversation was one I shall always remember and treasure.

A colleague at the university, Don, and I discussed the recent death of a co-worker. We talked about death -- his beliefs and mine. It was to be our last conversation, for he died just a few days later.

These conversations help to acclimate people to the transition process. Neither Don or Mom knew consciously that they were soon to die. Yet both felt the need to discuss death. It is important to be comfortable enough with the topic to discuss it when the conversation arises. Often there is an inner knowing and a need to discuss death as the hour approaches, much like the impending birth of a child is discussed.

People have taken the topic of death, and even the words associated with it, and made them naughty -- something we don't speak aloud in public. Children are shushed or quickly diverted if they bring up the topic. Our society is "death-a-phobic" and it's time this is changed.

By becoming comfortable with the words and concepts, when the magic moment arrives and you discover that you are dead, you won't be so shocked. Many people have a difficult time accepting their own death simply because of the shock value of the word. Ignoring and suppressing the idea of death throughout your life actually empowers the word. So take the power away from the words and concept of death by verbalizing and getting comfortable with them. Make the words "death" and "dead" as familiar as the word "birth" and "life".

Birth and death are both times of transition. They imply a change from one dimensional form to another. You don't see people going to pieces because someone gave birth like you do when people (especially themselves) die. Yet birth is much more traumatic and generally unpleasant to the one experiencing it. Death is a much easier transition.

A WORKING REALITY OF DEATH

Take a minute to imagine the following scene.

You find yourself inside a large cube or box. It can be of any material you choose. You are completely enclosed in this box. There are no doors or windows, no way to get in or out. You do not know how you got in or how to get out.

As you imagine yourself in this box, what are your reactions? What thoughts or feelings do you have? Remain in this imaginary state for a minute or so to fully experience your feelings.

STOP! DON'T READ ANY FURTHER UNTIL YOU HAVE TAKEN A MINUTE TO EXPERIENCE THIS SENSATION!

Good. Did you feel panic? How about curiosity? There are a multitude of reactions, and yours are perfectly normal regardless of what they were.

Your reactions to this exercise are similar to those you might experience as you pass into death. Now reexamine your reactions to the box, only apply these to death. How do you feel about death? Don't judge yourself, simply examine. You now have a starting point from which to examine your current death beliefs.

For our second exercise, imagine yourself walking down a path. Create your path; notice the details. Is it wide, narrow, smooth, rough, beautiful, not-so-beautiful, straight, or winding? You decide. After you walk for awhile you come to a wall. The wall can be any form you like, but it must run across your path and stretch so far that you cannot walk around it. Create the wall now!

Now move beyond the wall. What do you see? Take a minute to experience this vision. Relax and play with the images. Don't read on until you have experienced this!

No fudging!

This path represents your view of your life. Was your life easy or rough? Was your path well worn, or are you blazing new trails? Was your path straight or winding? If you did not like your path, know that you have full power to change it any time you choose. You can add plants, flowers -- in short, create any path you choose whenever you choose.

Examine the wall. Was it high and solid or low and insubstantial? What kind was it? How did you move beyond the wall? Was it hard? What were your reactions to moving beyond the wall? What did you find on the other side?

The wall represents the separation of life and death. Beyond the wall is your symbolic subconscious view of the afterlife. Now reexamine your images. If you do not like what you experienced, simply choose a new creation and construct new images.

There are no right answers, yet, at the same time, all answers are right. Your answers represent a combination of what you have been conditioned to believe about death and your personal reality of death. If you are happy with your subconscious death reality, that's great. If you are uncomfortable with your symbolic representation of death, then create a new one as you read on.

Death need not be scary. In fact, in many ways death can be compared to going away to college. It may cause a little apprehension at first. The change may even produce some stress. But after awhile you can actually become excited about the prospect of going away to your great new adventure. There are many who would even say you are lucky to be going. Death is even easier than college because there is no packing to do, no tuition to pay, nor written exams to take.

As you get comfortable with the concept of death, then you can begin to let go of any fearful notions of death. Allow yourself to have a variety of death options, all pleasant. This allows you to stay open and receptive to your own unique death adventure when it occurs, which may be different from the one you have created.

If, however, the concept of death still makes you tremble with fear, and you can't leave it in such an unformed and unpleasant condition, then take a few moments to create your own picture of what death will be like for you. Play this image over and over until it becomes your new reality of death. Thus, when you die you will automatically create this familiar reality. Eventually the actual reality will pierce your awareness, but this created reality will be a pleasant first encounter, certainly much better than fear or panic.

#### Failed states don’t cause terrorism which is the terminal impact in their manwaring evidence

**Patrick, ‘11** [Stewart, Research Fellow at the Center for Global Development, “Weak Links: Fragile States, Global Threats, and International Security,” Google Books]

A central motivation for recent U.S. and international attention to weak and failing states is the conviction that such countries enable transnational terrorist networks. “Weak and impoverished states and ungoverned areas are . . . susceptible to exploita­tion by terrorists,” declares the 2006 U.S. National Security Strategy. Such claims seem plausible. All things being equal, terrorist groups would presumably prefer to operate within corrupt, unstable, and violent states that lack effective control over their terri­tories. Weak states from Sudan to Pakistan have at times provided transnational terror­ist organizations, including al-Qaeda, with certain benefits. These include off ering sanctuary to conduct and plan operations; access to weapons, conflict experience, financial resources, and pools of recruits; supply lines, transit zones, staging grounds and targets for attack; and opportunities to gain ideological support through provision of services left by the vacuum of state capacity. Certainly, jihadist web sites have iden­tified weak and failing states as attractive targets of opportunity for al-Qaeda and affi l­iated organizations. With these presumed connections in mind, the U.S. National Strategy for Combating Terrorism commits the United States to “diminishing the underlying conditions that terrorists seek to exploit,” by bolstering state capacities, alleviating poverty, and pro­moting good governance. A major strategic aim in the U.S.-led campaign against global terrorism is to deny terrorists access to poorly governed lands, including in Africa, where porous borders, political instability, and lawless regions are perceived as vulnerabilities. Chapter 2 takes a closer look at the connection between state weakness and transna­tional terrorism, focusing on the most pressing terrorist threat to U.S. and interna­tional security: the global presence and activities of al-Qaeda and the broader Salafi jihadist movement. Based on an analysis of global patterns and specific country case studies, it concludes that the links between state weakness and transnational terrorism are more complicated and tenuous than often assumed. To begin with, it is obvious that not all (or even most) weak and failed states are afflicted by terrorism. By itself, weak capacity cannot explain why terrorist activity is concentrated in the Middle East and broader Muslim world, rather than other regions like Central Africa. Clearly, other variables and dynamics—including political, religious, cultural, and geographical factors—shape its global distribution. Nor are all weak and failing states equally attractive to transnational terrorists. Conventional wisdom holds that collapsed, lawless polities like Somalia are particu­larly vulnerable. In fact, terrorists are likely to find weak but functioning states like Pakistan or Kenya more congenial long term bases of operations. Such poorly gov­erned states are fragile and susceptible to corruption, but they also provide easy access to the financial and logistical infrastructure of the global economy, including commu­nications technology, transportation, and banking services. Moreover, weak states may be of declining importance to transnational terrorists as the al-Qaeda threat has evolved from a centrally directed network, dependent on a “base,” into a more diffuse global movement, with autonomous cells in dozens of countries, poor and wealthy alike. Moreover, some of the supposed benefits of weak states to transnational terrorists are less important than often assumed. Among the most attractive attributes such states present to terrorists are safe havens for leadership cadres; conflict experience for terrorist fighters; opportunities for training and planning; and weak border and cus­toms control. With important exceptions, however, weak states rarely provide large pools of recruits, attractive targets of operations, or opportunities to win popular support through the performance of para-state functions. Whether states provide lucrative sources of terrorist financing depends on the presence of exploitable resources. Beyond these factors, two other sets of variables appear critical in determining the attractiveness of fragile states to transnational terrorists. The first are the social/cultural attributes of the country in question. Although national security experts often speak of “ungoverned” spaces, such territories are more commonly “alternatively” governed, by non-state forms of social and political arrangements, including tribes. The specific cultural and social milieu of the state (or region) in question—and the interests and ideology of local power-wielders—will often determine whether transnational terror­ists are able to set up shop. The second, arguably most important, variable is the attitude of the state itself. Independent of a state’s objective capacity to oppose terrorism, its actual policy may occupy a blurry middle ground between wholehearted sponsorship and clear opposition. As U.S. experiences with Pakistan in the years fol­lowing 9/11 underscore, even countries designated “critical allies in the global war on terrorism” may pursue ambiguous policies, particularly if the state itself is internally fragmented.

#### **No impact to bioterror.**

Soligenex 13 (Soligenex Inc. is a clinical stage biopharmaceutical company focused on developing products to treat inflammatory diseases and biodefense countermeasures, BioDefense and Emerging Diseases, http://www.soligenix.com/prod\_def.shtml, Website last updated 2013)

Since 2001, a new sense of vulnerability to radiation, infectious diseases, toxins and chemical agents has generated significant research and development efforts to identify and produce innovative therapies and means to protect against threats that could be used as biological weapons. There is a growing need for products that protect the population against such agents of bioterrorism, as well as against emerging infectious diseases that could arise through natural epidemics. With very few exceptions, such products do not exist, and those that are available for current deployment are based on outdated and sometimes ineffective technologies. Many of these products will only be used in the event of an emergency. Products to combat biological warfare or bioterrorism will be supplied to the population from medicines stored in the US Strategic National Stockpile (SNS). The federal government has previously established a special fund to acquire biological warfare countermeasures (termed Project Bioshield), which allocated $5.6 billion over a 10-year period to acquire products for the SNS. Realizing that many of these countermeasures do not yet exist, the US government has recently established the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority (BARDA). The existence of BARDA creates a situation in which products arising from research, primarily sponsored by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the Department of Defense (DoD), can be prioritized and then developed for large-scale manufacturing and clinical evaluation, and ultimately acquisition of the product for the SNS. Soligenix, Inc. is addressing the development of products and technologies that can be used to protect against several biological threats considered agents of bioterrorism, consistent with biological warfare threats and emerging diseases that the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID), a division of the NIH, has identified as high priorities. Soligenix is developing several potential products to prevent morbidity and mortality due to the threat of biological toxins for which preventive vaccination is the most feasible means to protect a susceptible population. This approach is being taken because the known mechanism of protection against toxin exposure is mediated through antibodies in the serum or present on mucosal surfaces that can be elicited by vaccination with subunit immunogens. Soligenix's process for product development of biodefense products is highly cooperative with government funding, since the government itself will be the final supplier of the products. Currently, Soligenix is operating under a $9.4 million grant award from NIAID, which will fund, over a five-year period, the development of formulation and manufacturing processes for vaccines, including RiVax™ (ricin toxin vaccine), and VeloThrax™ (anthrax vaccine) that are stable at elevated temperatures. The grant will also fund the development of improved thermostable adjuvants expected to result in rapidly acting vaccines that can be given with fewer injections over shorter intervals. In addition, Soligenix is expanding the range of applicability of its lead product, oral beclomethasone dipropionate (BDP), referred to as OrbeShield™, for gastrointestinal Acute Radiation Syndrome (ARS).

#### No chemical terrorism

**Erwin and Manguson 2009** – managing editor of National Defense Magazine (Sandra and Stew, National Defense Magazine, "7 deadly myths about weapons of terror", http://www.nationaldefensemagazine.org/ARCHIVE/2009/JUNE/Pages/7Deadly.aspx?PF=1, WEA)

Myth #7: Nerve Gasses Are Terrorists’ Chemical Weapons of Choice To say that nerve gasses such as sarin toban, or VX are not threats would be a stretch. After all, the first acts of “ultra-terrorism” — defined as the use of a weapon of mass destruction in a terrorist attack — employed sarin. The Aum Shinrikyo cult first dispersed the Nazi-era nerve gas on the town of Matsumoto, Japan, in June 1994. Less than a year later, it released the same substance in five Tokyo subway cars during rush hour. But a study of how the doomsday cult acquired and manufactured sarin, and other chemical and biological weapons, suggests that a similar organization would have a hard time producing such complex weapons in today’s security environment. Meanwhile, shipments of deadly chlorine gas, a substance which also has been used in terrorist attacks, continues to roll through U.S. rail yards on their way to water treatment plants, with little protection. Because Japan had laws restricting how far the police could go in investigating religious organizations, Aum Shinrikyo was able to amass millions of dollars to pursue its goals to create an Apocalypse. It used money bilked from followers and legitimate businesses to build complex chemical weapon plants in remote areas and amassed stockpiles of chemicals, as detailed in David E. Kaplan and Andrew Marshall’s book on the case, “The Cult at the End of the World.” Aum purposefully recruited alienated chemistry and engineering students from top universities and set them to work creating weapons of mass destruction. They produced a variety of nerve gasses, biological agents such as anthrax and botulism and were even considering the purchase of a nuclear bomb from the former Soviet Union. Despite the organization’s technical prowess, it was never able to master the art of dispersing chemical and biological agents. It was reduced to poking holes in plastic bags with sharpened umbrella tips in the subway attack. Could such efforts be duplicated today? It’s hard to see such a large operation flying under the radar of police and intelligence agencies in the post-9/11 world and particularly in modern nations such as Japan and the United States. Islamic terrorists in ungoverned territories, given the ability to find technical experts and the funding, could duplicate Aum Shinrikyo’s “success,” but would still have to smuggle the volatile substances in large containers to their intended target. As many counterterrorism experts have pointed out, the 9/11 masterminds did not have to smuggle any weapons into the United States to carry out their plot. They used what was on hand.

**Energy boom now -- that solves.**

Johnson 12/2

, Tim, “Fuel boom key to U.S. superpower status?” http://www.santafenewmexican.com/news/fuel-boom-key-to-u-s-superpower-status/article\_82ae5b45-d49f-58d9-9832-8cae2d29b7f5.html)//DR. H

For the past 40 years, U.S. presidents have launched distant wars, allied with autocratic sheiks and dispatched naval fleets to protect sea lanes, all for the imperative of keeping foreign oil spigots flowing.

That imperative has now subsided. Rather suddenly, the center of gravity of global energy production has swung toward the Americas as shale oil and gas fields in North Dakota and Texas hum with activity. America is moving to the fore as the world’s largest producer of petroleum and natural gas. That change will reorder the globe in ways large and small.

U.S. experts say it will prolong the United States’ position as the predominant global superpower. Arab nations that shook the world with the 1973 oil embargo almost certainly will be weakened. Russia will find its power ebb as European nations find alternate suppliers for natural gas. New energy technologies will reorder the scales of global winners and losers.

**Heg not k2 Liberal norms.**

**Ikenberry 11**

a transition in the ideas and principles that underlie the global order. has already emerged. A But this panicked narrative misses a **deeper reality**: emerging great powers do not want to contest the basic rules and principles of the liberal international order; they wish to gain more authority and leadership within it. Indeed, today's power transition represents not **the defeat of the liberal order but its ultimate ascendance**. Brazil, China, and India have all become more prosperous and capable by operating inside the existing international order they have **deep interests in preserving** that system. the liberal international order has no competitors. On the contrary, the rise of non-Western powers and the growth of economic and security interdependence are creating new constituencies for it. To be sure, as wealth and power become less concentrated in the United States' hands, the country will be less able to shape world politics. But the underlying foundations of the liberal international order will survive and **thrive**.

**Transition theory is flawed – three reasons**

**Nexon 09** – Daniel, Assistant professor in the Department of Government and the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University. “The Balance of Power in the Balance,” World Politics – Volume 61, Number 2, April 2009, Muse

Hegemonic order and power transition accounts also contain theories of power balances (and of balancing) but comprise, at best, extremely weak balance of power theories. Both suggest that systemic balances of power should obtain only under restricted conditions. First, differences in relative growth rates might create a rough equilibrium between major powers. Second, major shifts in administrative, military, social, or economic technologies might shift relative capabilities and thereby create a systemic balance of power. Third, dissatisfaction with the current orders allocation of status, material benefits, or other goods might lead states to enhance their capabilities to challenge a predominate power while accelerating processes of hegemonic overextension (Lemke, BoP:T&P, 55–58).28

**Vulnerability checks.**

**Boehmer ‘7** (Charles, political science professor at the University of Texas, Politics & Policy, 35:4, “The Effects of Economic Crisis, Domestic Discord, and State Efficacy on the Decision to Initiate Interstate Conflict”)

Economic Growth and Fatal MIDs The theory presented earlier predicts that lower rates of growth suppress participation in foreign conflicts, particularly concerning conflict initiation and escalation to combat. To sustain combat, states need to be militarily prepared and not open up a second front when they are already fighting, or may fear, domestic opposition. A good example would be when the various Afghani resistance fighters expelled the Soviet Union from their territory, but the Taliban crumbled when it had to face the combined forces of the United States and Northern Alliance insurrection. Yet the coefficient for GDP growth and MID initiations was negative but insignificant. However, considering that there are many reasons why states fight, the logic presented earlier should hold especially in regard to the risk of participating in more severe conflicts. Threats to use military force may be safe to make and may be made with both external and internal actors in mind, but in the end may remain mere cheap talk that does not risk escalation if there is a chance to back down. Chiozza and Goemans (2004b) found that secure leaders were more likely to become involved in war than insecure leaders, supporting the theory and evidence presented here. We should find that leaders who face domestic opposition and a poorly performing economy shy away from situations that could escalate to combat if doing so would compromise their ability to retain power.

**Just scary predictions and data consensus.**

**Barnett ‘9** (Thomas P.M Barnett, senior managing director of Enterra Solutions LLC, contributing editor/online columnist for Esquire, 8/25/’9 – “The New Rules: Security Remains Stable Amid Financial Crisis,” Aprodex, Asset Protection Index, http://www.aprodex.com/the-new-rules--security-remains-stable-amid-financial-crisis-398-bl.aspx)

When the global financial crisis struck roughly a year ago, the blogosphere was ablaze with all sorts of scary predictions of, and commentary regarding, ensuing conflict and wars -- a rerun of the Great Depression leading to world war, as it were. Now, as global economic news brightens and recovery -- surprisingly led by China and emerging markets -- is the talk of the day, it's interesting to look back over the past year and realize how globalization's first truly worldwide recession has had virtually no impact whatsoever on the international security landscape.¶ None of the more than three-dozen ongoing conflicts listed by GlobalSecurity.org can be clearly attributed to the global recession. Indeed, the last new entry (civil conflict between Hamas and Fatah in the Palestine) predates the economic crisis by a year, and three quarters of the chronic struggles began in the last century. Ditto for the 15 low-intensity conflicts listed by Wikipedia (where the latest entry is the Mexican "drug war" begun in 2006). Certainly, the Russia-Georgia conflict last August was specifically timed, but by most accounts the opening ceremony of the Beijing Olympics was the most important external trigger (followed by the U.S. presidential campaign) for that sudden spike in an almost two-decade long struggle between Georgia and its two breakaway regions.¶ Looking over the various databases, then, we see a most familiar picture: the usual mix of civil conflicts, insurgencies, and liberation-themed terrorist movements. Besides the recent Russia-Georgia dust-up, the only two potential state-on-state wars (North v. South Korea, Israel v. Iran) are both tied to one side acquiring a nuclear weapon capacity -- a process wholly unrelated to global economic trends.¶ And with the United States effectively tied down by its two ongoing major interventions (Iraq and Afghanistan-bleeding-into-Pakistan), our involvement elsewhere around the planet has been quite modest, both leading up to and following the onset of the economic crisis: e.g., the usual counter-drug efforts in Latin America, the usual military exercises with allies across Asia, mixing it up with pirates off Somalia's coast). Everywhere else we find serious instability we pretty much let it burn, occasionally pressing the Chinese -- unsuccessfully -- to do something. Our new Africa Command, for example, hasn't led us to anything beyond advising and training local forces.

**Reverse investment checks**

**WSJ 07 –** (9/29, How Economy Could Survive Oil At $100 a Barrel, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB119102487310743331.html)

For all the concern, the world today is better equipped to swallow expensive oil than it was when Jimmy Carter was installing solar panels and a wood-burning stove in the White House.

The main reason has to do with what some call the Wal-Mart effect. For every extra dollar taken from drivers’ pockets at the pump in the form of higher prices in recent years, low-cost exporters from China and elsewhere have put roughly $1.50 back in the form of cheaper retail goods. Even at today’s near-record prices, U.S. households today spend less than 4% of their disposable income at the pump, vs. over 6% in 1980.

Current prices are also a reflection of a strong economy, not an oil embargo or war in the Middle East. Since a market-share war between Saudi Arabia and Venezuela flooded the market with oil and drove prices to below $11 a barrel in 1998, oil prices have risen nearly eight-fold. During that run, the global economy grew roughly 5% each year.

Strong growth in places like China helps take some of the edge off the oil-price blow for U.S. and European companies such as Detroit’s Big Three auto makers. Many emerging markets are hitting a “takeoff” stage, where per-capita income reaches a level that sparks serious auto demand, says Ellen Hughes-Cromwick, Ford Motor Co.’s chief economist. Growth in emerging markets is a “structural development” that is “less sensitive to oil-price changes,” she says.

“There’s a more relaxed attitude now,” said Daniel Yergin, a noted oil historian and chairman of Cambridge Energy Research Associates. At a recent event promoting Alan Greenspan’s new memoir, Mr. Yergin asked the former Fed chief on stage if $80 oil was a concern. “He basically shrugged and said, ‘Not so far,’” Mr. Yergin recalls.

Economists see global growth slowing but still chugging along at a relatively healthy 3% this year and next. High oil prices also mean more money for oil-producing nations such as Russia and Saudi Arabia to invest globally. “If resource owners are now getting a bigger piece of the pie to spend and invest, then $100 oil shouldn’t be a problem” in the absence of a U.S. recession, says independent energy economist Philip Verleger Jr. “And that investment is happening.”