#### US hegemony is essential to solve perpetual war and improve quality of life – empire is the alternative to free trade and US military dominance

Thomas P.M. Barnett. 2011 Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College American military geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat., worked as the Assistant for Strategic Futures in the Office of Force Transformation in the Department of Defense, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” March 7 <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads>

It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II. Let me be more blunt: As the guardian of globalization, the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation. But the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace. We introduced the international liberal trade order known as globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts. That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come. To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization -- one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism. America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding.

#### And, there’s no risk of their Chinese threat construction impacts:

####  a. if their link arguments about the ideological otherization of this policymaking frame, current policymakers already believe the China threat narrative so there’s no unique internal link

#### b. EVERY last piece of their Pan evidence presumes that we construct China as an irrational, initiator of aggression. Our argument is that their proliferation policies are short-sighted and risk technical catastrophe which could escalate to extinction. That’s the 1ac \_\_\_\_ evidence.

#### c. the alt can’t solve - if it is true that the China threat thesis is based on timeless Orientalist racism, then obviously no amount of ontological or epistemological reflection by the alt could overcome this racism. The ballot won’t modify the minds of policymakers meaning the link overwhelms the risk of alt. solvency.

#### d. and even if they win all their arguments – the aff still outweighs and turns the case – our theory of the benevolence of American hegemony can be empirically validated. Permitting the usurpation of Americna hegemony and accepting Chinese prolif is gambling with all future human existence. Cautionary principle dictates you err aff on a tie-breaker but we won’t need that since ONLY our solvency claims can be empirically verified. The total warfare of an American hegemony vacuum would exacerbate racism and violence exponentially worse than their non-unique, non-intrinsic link. That’s the 1ac \_\_\_\_\_\_ evidence.

#### China is deliberately fostering the image of a peaceful rise to mask its growing military threat. All their threat defense is the MANUFACTURED and dangerous knowledge – only a realistic assessment of China’s objectively dangerous disturbance of US Hege can solve.

Gertz 10

(Bill, geopolitics editor and a national security and investigative reporter for The Washington Times,author of six books, 3/5/10, Washington Times, “China rhetoric raises threat concerns”,http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/mar/5/harsh-words-from-chinese-military-raise-threat-con/print/)

Recent statements by Chinese military officials are raising concerns among U.S. analysts that the communist government in Beijing is shifting its oft-stated "peaceful rise" policy toward an aggressive, anti-U.S. posture. The most recent sign appeared with the publication of a government-approved book by Senior Col. Liu Mingfu that urges China to "sprint" toward becoming the world's most powerful state. "Although this book is one of many by a senior colonel, it certainly challenges the thesis of many U.S. China-watchers that the People's Liberation Army's rapid military growth is not designed to challenge the United States as a global power or the U.S. military," said Larry M. Wortzel, a China affairs specialist who until recently was co-chairman of the congressional U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission. A Reuters report on Col. Liu's book, "The China Dream," appeared Tuesday in the Communist Party newspaper People's Daily. It quoted the book as stating China and the United States are in "competition to be the leading country, a conflict over who rises and falls to dominate the world." Mr. Wortzel said the statements in the book contradict those of former President Jiang Zemin and otherChinese leaders who said China's rise to prominence in the 21st century would be peaceful. They also carry political weight because the book was published by the Chinese military. The book was released after calls by other Chinese military officials to punish the United States for policies toward Taiwan, U.S. criticism of China's lack of Internet freedom and U.S. support for the exiled Tibetan leader Dalai Lama. One official, Maj. Gen. Luo Yuan,called for using economic warfare against the U.S. over arms sales to Taiwan and urged selling off some of China's $750 billion in holdings of U.S. debt securities. China's military also recently cut off military exchanges with the Pentagon after the announcement of a$6.4 billion sale of helicopters and missiles to Taiwan

. Asked about Col. Liu's book, State Department spokesman P.J. Crowley said it would be wrong for China to view itself as a U.S. competitor. For the 21st century, U.S.-China relations are the most important ties in the world and "it isa mistake to see the relationship in zero-sum terms," Mr. Crowley said. Some U.S. officials in the past dismissed similar alarming statements from theChinese military as not reflecting official views. However, Chinese leaders have not disavowed Gen. Luo's remarks or those of others, such as Maj. Gen. Zhu Chenghu, who in 2005 said China would use nuclear weapons against the United States in response to any firing of conventionally armed long-range cruise missiles against Chinese cities. The statement contradicted Beijing's declared policy of not using nuclear weapons first in a conflict. Gen. Zhu reportedly was criticized and demoted but surfaced in print Feb. 10, calling for increased defense spending and boosting military deployments in response to the Taiwan arms sale. China on Thursday announced that it would increase defense spending this year by 7.5 percent ,a smaller increase than in previous years, in an apparent effort to limit criticism of its double-digit annual spending increases for more than a decade. The recent military statements also counter insistence by many U.S. officials that China's strategic intentions toward the United States are masked by the lack of "transparency" in the communist system. U.S. intelligence analysts, in analyses and estimates, also have dismissed or played down evidence of Chinese military deception to hide its true goals. They instead have said in classified reports that the use of strategic deception to hide China's military buildup is similar to masking efforts of Western powers. Critics of those analysts' "benign China" outlook say such views resulted in missing major strategic and military developments by China for more than a decade, such as new missiles, submarines and other advanced military hardware, some that were built in complete secrecy. The recent Chinese military statements have renewed the long-running debate in U.S. policy and intelligence circles about China's long-term military intentions and whether they pose threats to U.S. interests.

#### China is rising peacefully now because it is in their short term interest, they are a major long-term threat.

Kelly, 5/30/10

– Assistant Professor of Political Science at Pusan National University (Robert E, "Off to China… 1) The ‘ChinaThreat’ Thesis", Asian Security Blog, May 30th 2010, July 21st 2010, http://asiansecurityblog.wordpress.com/2010/05/30/off-to-china-1-the-china-threat-thesis/

1. China’s internal politics are repressive: Falun Gong, democracy dissidents, Muslim Uighurs, Tibet. Why would you expect a regime that treats its own people that way to be nicer to the ‘foreign devils’¶ (the 19th century mandarin term for western traders) ? Why would you trust a regime that shoots its own people? When Iran and Zimbabwe do it, we worry. Why not withChina? China is not a democracy.¶ 2. While China is rising, it is vulnerable. It is benefitting enormously from theUS/WTO-lead trading order. So of course they will say they want to rise peacefully. They won’t shootthemselves in the foot. They see how Germany’s belligerent rise in the late 19th century got it encircled andcrushed in WWI. They aren’t stupid enough to say they want changes, but we shouldn’t be stupid enough to believe them either¶ , especially given point 1 above.¶ 3. China has a historical legacy of xenophobia and culturalsupremacism. You can overcome history of course¶ ; the Germans did.¶ But the Chinese aren’t there at all, and itshistorical reservoir of national myths clashes badly with just being ‘one more country.’ 4. As countries grow andget wealthier, their perceptions of their national interests change¶ , ie, grow. So yes, today,¶ the Chinese do want to risepeacefully, and maybe they are sincere. But eventually ¶ , as its sense of its global role grows, and as the scope of its interests grow,¶ it will become pushier and probably more belligerent. This usually happens when countries grow to new prominence. Britain in the 19th century intervened all over Asia. The US got more involved in Latin Americaand the Pacific. The USSR dabbled in all over the place¶ during the Cold War. Maybe China is different, but¶ the historicalrecord of big states developing new ‘needs’ and ‘appetites’ is pretty clear. Expect it here. 5. What will they wantafter they get rich?¶ James Fallows’ work at the Atlantic suggests that China just wants to get rich, and that’s true, but what happens after they getthere?¶ As states become richer and more influential, their perceptions of their national interests expand –particularly as states trade more and import resources more (as most rising states must). It is all but inevitablethat China’s global footprint will expand¶ as it already has in Central Asia, Africa, and the South China Sea. This does not mean it must be belligerent, but it does mean that¶ there are more possible loci of conflict. The sheer size of China and its reach will insurefriction and collisions – just as it did with the British Empire, the USSR, and the US. Add to this China’s rathertoxic internal politics. China is hypernationalist¶ (the replacement ideology after Tiannamen),¶ mercantilist, and repressive.¶ Isee nothing benign in that mix. If you were China, wouldn’t you be chafing at the bit, having to listen to Bush or Hillary lecture you about human rightsand your exchange rate? And once the first missile lands on Tibet, all the talk of peaceful China will fly out the window. My first-cut schtick on the USand China is in galleys at Geopolitics for publication this fall; here it is in brief. For China’s muscle in the Northeast Asia, try here and here. In short, Ilean toward the view that China is a rising power likely to collide with the US, because its range of interests will expand as its power expands.¶ In 20 years, when China has a bigger navy, it will suddenly ‘discover’ national interests in the South Pacific or IndianOcean. Rome, Britain, the US, the USSR all went down this path. It is worse, because China has the Sinocentric history of informally dominating its¶ Confucian¶ neighbors. And the regime ideology is still fairly illiberal –mercantilism, hypernationalism, internal repression.

### K

#### Paradigm wars are useless – combining epistemologies is key to intellectual and political progress. Only the perm solves.

David A. Lake. 2011. Jerri-Ann and Gary E. Jacobs Professor of Social Sciences and Distinguished Professor of Political Science at the University of California, San Diego. Why “isms” are Evil: Theory, Epistemology, and Academic Sects as Impediments to Understanding and Progress. International Studies Quarterly 55, 465-480.

As I began, our task as scholars is to understand better the world in which we live. Our privileged position as scholars in society rests upon this goal, or at least its pursuit. We do not produce understanding by ﬁghting theological wars between ourselves at either the theoretical or epistemological levels. Rather, we achieve understanding by asking questions about important phenomena that we do not now understand well, employing appropriate theories to answer these questions, and then being honest with ourselves and others about the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence we have been able to bring to bear. Today, no single theoretical or epistemological approach deserves hegemony. Diversity of theory and method is necessary, at least at this stage of our intellectual development. Intellectual monocultures are rightfully feared. But the current cacophony is not what we should aspire to. Rather than useful debate we have turned inward to self-contained research traditions and epistemologies and, in turn, we focus on ﬁrst principles. Intellectual progress does not come from proclaiming ever more loudly the superiority of one’s approach to audiences who have stopped listening. Let’s end the theological crusades and seek progress in understanding real problems of world politics. Perhaps then we will earn the privileges society has accorded us.

#### Rejecting strategic predictions of threats makes them inevitable—decisionmakers will rely on preconceived conceptions over qualified analysts

Fitzsimmons, 07 (Michael, “The Problem of Uncertainty in Strategic Planning”, Survival, Winter 06/07)

But handling even this weaker form of uncertainty is still quite challeng- ing. If not sufficiently bounded, a high degree of variability in planning factors can exact a significant price on planning. The complexity presented by great variability strains the cognitive abilities of even the most sophisticated decision- makers.15 And even a robust decision-making process sensitive to cognitive limitations necessarily sacrifices depth of analysis for breadth as variability and complexity grows. It should follow, then, that in planning under conditions of risk, variability in strategic calculation should be carefully tailored to available analytic and decision processes. Why is this important? What harm can an imbalance between complexity and cognitive or analytic capacity in strategic planning bring? Stated simply, where analysis is silent or inadequate, the personal beliefs of decision-makers fill the void. As political scientist Richard Betts found in a study of strategic sur- prise, in ‘an environment that lacks clarity, abounds with conflicting data, and allows no time for rigorous assessment of sources and validity, ambiguity allows intuition or wishfulness to drive interpretation ... The greater the ambiguity, the greater the impact of preconceptions.’16 The decision-making environment that Betts describes here is one of political-military crisis, not long-term strategic planning. But a strategist who sees uncertainty as the central fact of his environ- ment brings upon himself some of the pathologies of crisis decision-making. He invites ambiguity, takes conflicting data for granted and substitutes a priori scepticism about the validity of prediction for time pressure as a rationale for discounting the importance of analytic rigour. It is important not to exaggerate the extent to which data and ‘rigorous assessment’ can illuminate strategic choices. Ambiguity is a fact of life, and scepticism of analysis is necessary. Accordingly, the intuition and judgement of decision-makers will always be vital to strategy, and attempting to subordinate those factors to some formulaic, deterministic decision-making model would be both undesirable and unrealistic. All the same, there is danger in the opposite extreme as well. Without careful analysis of what is relatively likely and what is relatively unlikely, what will be the possible bases for strategic choices? A decision-maker with no faith in prediction is left with little more than a set of worst-case scenarios and his existing beliefs about the world to confront the choices before him. Those beliefs may be more or less well founded, but if they are not made explicit and subject to analysis and debate regarding their application to particular strategic contexts, they remain only beliefs and premises, rather than rational judgements. Even at their best, such decisions are likely to be poorly understood by the organisations charged with their implementation. At their worst, such decisions may be poorly understood by the decision-makers themselves.

#### Threats are not socially constructed- decision makers use the most objective, rational, and accurate assessments possible- there are no bureaucratic or ideological motivations to invent threats.

Ravenal ‘9

[Earl C. Ravenal, distinguished senior fellow in foreign policy studies @ Cato, is professor emeritus of the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service. He is an expert on NATO, defense strategy, and the defense budget. He is the author of *Designing Defense for a New World Order.* What's Empire Got to Do with It? The Derivation of America's Foreign Policy.” *Critical Review: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Politics and Society* 21.1 (2009) 21-75]

Quite expectedly, the more doctrinaire of the non-interventionists take pains to deny any straightforward, and therefore legitimate, security motive in American foreign and military policy. In fact, this denial leads to a more sweeping rejection of any recognizably rational basis for American foreign policy, and, even, sometimes (among the more theoretical of the non-interventionists), a preference for non-rational accounts, or “models,” of virtually any nation’s foreign policy-making.4 One could call this tendency among anti-imperialists “motive displacement.” More specifically, in the cases under review here, one notes a receptivity to any reworking of history, and any current analysis of geopolitics, that denigrates “the threat”; and, along with this, a positing of “imperialism” (the almost self-referential and primitive impulse) as a sufficient explanation for the often strenuous and risky actions of great powers such as the United States. Thus, not only is “empire” taken to be a sufficient and, in some cases, a necessary condition in bringing about foreign “threats”; but, by minimizing the extent and seriousness of these threats, the anti-imperialists put themselves into the position of lacking a rational explanation for the derivation of the (pointless at best, counter-productive at worst) policies that they designate as imperialistic. A pungent example of this threat denigration and motive displacement is Eland’s account of American intervention in the Korean and Vietnam wars:

After North Korea invaded, the Truman administration intervened merely for the purpose of a demonstration to friends and foes alike. Likewise, according to eminent cold war historians, the United States did not inter- vene in Vietnam because it feared communism, which was fragmented, or the Soviet Union, which wanted détente with the West, or China, which was weak, but because it did not want to appear timid to the world. The behavior of the United States in both Korea and Vietnam is typical of imperial powers, which are always concerned about their reputation, pres- tige, and perceived resolve. (Eland 2004, 64)

Of course, the motive of “reputation,” to the extent that it exists in any particular instance, is a part of the complex of motives that characterize a great power that is drawn toward the role of hegemon (not the same thing as “empire”). Reputation is also a component of the power projec- tion that is designed to serve the interest of national security. Rummaging through the concomitants of “imperialism,” Eland (2004, 65) discovers the thesis of “threat inflation” (in this case, virtual threat invention): Obviously, much higher spending for the military, homeland security, and foreign aid are required for a policy of global intervention than for a policy of merely defending the republic. For example, after the cold war, the security bureaucracies began looking for new enemies to justify keeping defense and intelligence budgets high. Similarly, Eland (ibid., 183), in a section entitled “Imperial Wars Spike Corporate Welfare,” attributes a large portion of the U.S. defense budget—particularly the procurement of major weapons systems, such as “Virginia-class submarines . . . aircraft carriers . . . F-22 fighters . . . [and] Osprey tilt-rotor transport aircraft”—not to the systemically derived requirement for certain kinds of military capabilities, but, rather, to the imperatives of corporate pork. He opines that such weapons have no stra- tegic or operational justification; that “the American empire, militarily more dominant than any empire in world history, can fight brushfire wars against terrorists and their ‘rogue’ state sponsors without those gold- plated white elephants.”

The underlying notion of “the security bureaucracies . . . looking for new enemies” is a threadbare concept that has somehow taken hold across the political spectrum, from the radical left (viz. Michael Klare [1981], who refers to a “threat bank”), to the liberal center (viz. Robert H. Johnson [1997], who dismisses most alleged “threats” as “improbable dangers”), to libertarians (viz. Ted Galen Carpenter [1992], Vice President for Foreign and Defense Policy of the Cato Institute, who wrote a book entitled A Search for Enemies). What is missing from most analysts’ claims of “threat inflation,” however, is a convincing theory of why, say, the American government significantly (not merely in excusable rhetoric) might magnify and even invent threats (and, more seriously, act on such inflated threat estimates). In a few places, Eland (2004, 185) suggests that such behavior might stem from military or national security bureaucrats’ attempts to enhance their personal status and organizational budgets, or even from the influence and dominance of “the military-industrial complex”; viz.: “Maintaining the empire and retaliating for the blowback from that empire keeps what President Eisenhower called the military-industrial complex fat and happy.” Or, in the same section:

In the nation’s capital, vested interests, such as the law enforcement bureaucracies . . . routinely take advantage of “crises”to satisfy parochial desires. Similarly, many corporations use crises to get pet projects— a.k.a. pork—funded by the government. And national security crises, because of people’s fears, are especially ripe opportunities to grab largesse. (Ibid., 182)

Thus, “bureaucratic-politics” theory, which once made several reputa- tions (such as those of Richard Neustadt, Morton Halperin, and Graham Allison) in defense-intellectual circles, and spawned an entire sub-industry within the field of international relations,5 is put into the service of dismissing putative security threats as imaginary. So, too, can a surprisingly cognate theory, “public choice,”6 which can be considered the right-wing analog of the “bureaucratic-politics” model, and is a preferred interpretation of governmental decision- making among libertarian observers. As Eland (2004, 203) summarizes:

Public-choice theory argues [that] the government itself can develop sepa- rate interests from its citizens. The government reflects the interests of powerful pressure groups and the interests of the bureaucracies and the bureaucrats in them. Although this problem occurs in both foreign and domestic policy, it may be more severe in foreign policy because citizens pay less attention to policies that affect them less directly.

There is, in this statement of public-choice theory, a certain ambiguity, and a certain degree of contradiction: Bureaucrats are supposedly, at the same time, subservient to societal interest groups and autonomous from society in general.

This journal has pioneered the argument that state autonomy is a likely consequence of the public’s ignorance of most areas of state activity (e.g., Somin 1998; DeCanio 2000a, 2000b, 2006, 2007; Ravenal 2000a). But state autonomy does not necessarily mean that bureaucrats substitute their own interests for those of what could be called the “national society” that they ostensibly serve. I have argued (Ravenal 2000a) that, precisely because of the public-ignorance and elite-expertise factors, and especially because the opportunities—at least for bureaucrats (a few notable post-government lobbyist cases nonwithstanding)—for lucrative self-dealing are stringently fewer in the defense and diplomatic areas of government than they are in some of the contract-dispensing and more under-the-radar-screen agencies of government, the “public-choice” imputation of self-dealing, rather than working toward the national interest (which, however may not be synonymous with the interests, perceived or expressed, of citizens!) is less likely to hold. In short, state autonomy is likely to mean, in the derivation of foreign policy, that “state elites” are using rational judgment, in insulation from self-promoting interest groups—about what strategies, forces, and weapons are required for national defense.

Ironically, “public choice”—not even a species of economics, but rather a kind of political interpretation—is not even about “public” choice, since, like the bureaucratic-politics model, it repudiates the very notion that bureaucrats make truly “public” choices; rather, they are held, axiomatically, to exhibit “rent-seeking” behavior, wherein they abuse their public positions in order to amass private gains, or at least to build personal empires within their ostensibly official niches. Such sub- rational models actually explain very little of what they purport to observe. Of course, there is some truth in them, regarding the “behavior” of some people, at some times, in some circumstances, under some conditions of incentive and motivation. But the factors that they posit operate mostly as constraints on the otherwise rational optimization of objectives that, if for no other reason than the playing out of official roles, transcends merely personal or parochial imperatives.

My treatment of “role” differs from that of the bureaucratic-politics theorists, whose model of the derivation of foreign policy depends heavily, and acknowledgedly, on a narrow and specific identification of the role- playing of organizationally situated individuals in a partly conflictual “pulling and hauling” process that “results in” some policy outcome. Even here, bureaucratic-politics theorists Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow (1999, 311) allow that “some players are not able to articulate [sic] the governmental politics game because their conception of their job does not legitimate such activity.” This is a crucial admission, and one that points— empirically—to the need for a broader and generic treatment of role.

Roles (all theorists state) give rise to “expectations” of performance. My point is that virtually every governmental role, and especially national-security roles, and particularly the roles of the uniformed mili- tary, embody expectations of devotion to the “national interest”; rational- ity in the derivation of policy at every functional level; and objectivity in the treatment of parameters, especially external parameters such as “threats” and the power and capabilities of other nations.

Sub-rational models (such as “public choice”) fail to take into account even a partial dedication to the “national” interest (or even the possibility that the national interest may be honestly misconceived in more paro- chial terms). In contrast, an official’s role connects the individual to the (state-level) process, and moderates the (perhaps otherwise) self-seeking impulses of the individual. Role-derived behavior tends to be formalized and codified; relatively transparent and at least peer-reviewed, so as to be consistent with expectations; surviving the particular individual and trans- mitted to successors and ancillaries; measured against a standard and thus corrigible; defined in terms of the performed function and therefore derived from the state function; and uncorrrupt, because personal cheating and even egregious aggrandizement are conspicuously discouraged.

My own direct observation suggests that defense decision-makers attempt to “frame” the structure of the problems that they try to solve on the basis of the most accurate intelligence. They make it their business to know where the threats come from. Thus, threats are not “socially constructed” (even though, of course, some values are).

A major reason for the rationality, and the objectivity, of the process is that much security planning is done, not in vaguely undefined circum- stances that offer scope for idiosyncratic, subjective behavior, but rather in structured and reviewed organizational frameworks. Non-rationalities (which are bad for understanding and prediction) tend to get filtered out. People are fired for presenting skewed analysis and for making bad predictions. This is because something important is riding on the causal analysis and the contingent prediction. For these reasons, “public choice” does not have the “feel” of reality to many critics who have participated in the structure of defense decision-making. In that structure, obvious, and even not-so-obvious, “rent-seeking” would not only be shameful; it would present a severe risk of career termination. And, as mentioned, the defense bureaucracy is hardly a productive place for truly talented rent-seekers to operate, compared to opportunities for personal profit in the commercial world. A bureaucrat’s very self-placement in these reaches of government testi- fies either to a sincere commitment to the national interest or to a lack of sufficient imagination to exploit opportunities for personal profit.

#### Imperialism is key to stop genocide – anti-imperialism guarantees inaction

Marko Attila Hoare 2006. Advisory Editor of Democratiya. Formerly a Research Fellow in the Faculty of History, University of Cambridge, he is now a Senior Research Fellow at Kingston University, London. He is the author of How Bosnia Armed, a short history of the Bosnian Army, published by Saqi Books in 2004. “Occidentalism: The West in the Eyes of its Enemies.” Democratiya 2006]

Anti-imperialism is based on a demonstrable falsehood – that Western military intervention always has negative results. Everyone knows that British and US military intervention liberated Western Europe from Nazism, and most anti- imperialists would concede that this was a good thing, but few are willing to acknowledge the implications of this for the anti-imperialist paradigm. External military intervention by Western ‘imperial’ powers helped to ensure the victory of the American Revolution; the liberation of Greece from the Ottoman Empire; the triumph of Italian unification; the liberation of Poland and Finland from Russia and the South Slavs from the Habsburg Empire. The anti-Nazi resistance movement in Yugoslavia during World War II received crucial military support from the Western Allies, including the bombing of enemy targets (and involving the killing of many civilians). Conversely, the failure of democratic states to intervene militarily led in the 1930s to the fascist victory in Spain, the Italian conquest of Abyssinia and the Nazi conquest of Czechoslovakia. The Western Allies could arguably have saved hundreds of thousands of Jewish and other lives by bombing the railway lines to Auschwitz, but chose not to; they nevertheless defeated Hitler, ended the Holocaust and saved hundreds of thousands more. Western military action could have halted the Rwandan genocide and prevented the Srebrenica massacre. Western military action did end Saddam’s persecution of the Kuwaitis and Kurds, and Milošević’s persecution of the Kosovo Albanians. Yet the anti-imperialists persist with their myth that Western military intervention must necessarily bring totally negative results – not because it is true, but because their ideology depends upon it. ¶ 9) Anti-imperialism is anti-internationalist. By rejecting Western military intervention, the anti-imperialists reject the only means by which Western progressives can hope to halt genocide and fight oppression and tyranny abroad. The more honourable and decent anti-imperialists have been ready to express solidarity with the suffering people of Rwanda, Bosnia, Kosovo and Iraq. Yet such expressions of solidarity do nothing to halt genocide or persecution. By rejecting Western military intervention, the anti-imperialists confine themselves, at best, to being passive spectators in foreign conflicts. More usually, however, they are uninterested in such conflicts, unless and until the Western powers intervene in a more high-profile manner – in which case the anti-imperialists invariably mobilise to preserve the status quo and defend the fascists and persecutors from ‘Western military intervention.’

#### Kritiks of western imperialism and hegemony justify violence and genocide. This is a reason why the epistemology of liberal democratic is a good one.

**Reiff 99**

David Reiff, Famous Author and Columnist, Summer 99

<http://www.worldpolicy.org/journal/rieff2.html>, WPJ, XVI, No. 2

The conclusion is inescapable. At the present time, **only the West has both the power and**, however intermittently, the **readiness to act.** And by the West, one really means the United States. Obviously, to say that America could act effectively if it chose to do so as, yes, the world's policeman of last resort, is not the same thing as saying that it should. Those who argue, as George Kennan has done, that we overestimate ourselves when we believe we can right the wrongs of the world, must be listened to seriously. So should the views of principled isolationists. And those on what remains of the left who insist that the result of such a broad licensing of American power will be a further entrenchment of America's hegemony over the rest of the world are also unquestionably correct.

What Is to Be Done But the implications of not doing anything are equally clear. Those who fear American power are-this is absolutely certain-**condemning other people to death**. Had the U.S. armed forces not set up the air bridge to eastern Zaire in the wake of the Rwandan genocide, hundreds of thousands of people would have perished, rather than the tens of thousands who did die. This does not excuse the Clinton administration for failing to act to stop the genocide militarily; but it is a fact. And analogous situations were found in Bosnia and even, for all its failings, in the operation in Somalia. Is this proposal tantamount to calling for a recolonization of part of the world? Would such a system make the United States even more powerful than it is already? Clearly it is, and clearly it would. But what are the alternatives? Kosovo demonstrates how little stomach the United States has for the kind of military action that its moral ambitions impel it to undertake. And there will be many more Kosovos in the coming decades. With the victory of capitalism nearly absolute, the choice is not between systems but about what kind of capitalist system we are going to have and what kind of world order that system requires. However controversial it may be to say this, our choice at the millennium seems to **boil down to imperialism or barbarism.** Half-measures of the type we have seen in various humanitarian interventions and in Kosovo represent the worst of both worlds. Better to grasp the nettle and accept that liberal imperialism may be the best we are going to do in these **callous and sentimental times.**  Indeed, the real task for people who reject both realism and the utopian nihilism of a left that would **prefer to see genocide** in Bosnia and the mass deportation of the Kosovars rather than strengthen, however marginally, the hegemony of the United States, is to try to humanize this new imperial order-assuming it can come into being-and to curb the excesses that it will doubtless produce. The alternative is not liberation, or the triumph of some global consensus of conscience, but, to paraphrase Che Guevara, **one, two, three, many Kosovos**.

#### Imperialism is key to stop terrorism and worse hegemons

Earl C. Ravenal 2009. Distinguished senior fellow in foreign policy studies @ Cato, is professor emeritus of the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service. He is an expert on NATO, defense strategy, and the defense budget. He is the author of Designing Defense for a New World Order. What's Empire Got to Do with It? The Derivation of America's Foreign Policy.” Critical Review: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Politics and Society 21.1 (2009) 21-75

Most of the anti-imperialists and, more broadly, the non-interventionists happily see isolationism as the beneficent solution to America’s existent and prospective difficulties with uncontrollable forces and rising powers in the world. And one might, indeed, make a qualified prediction that such a stance might, one day, be adopted (though, reluctantly) by the United States, in the face of widespread international obstruction and hostility, and in the event of its own material inability to sustain a role of hegemony. But such a stance is to be seen as a fall-back position, not an unequivocally preferred national strategy. In fact, a reasonably detached observer might judge that the case against (even conditional, even occasional) military intervention is not sustained. It could be argued that s, or to keep them off balance (even on less-than-perfect intelligence); maintaining a wide national decisions are made, not on their own merits, but because the alternatives are worse. Thus, if the United States were to withdraw from exerting forceful influence on global politics, and, indeed, on the determination of the structure and quality of the international system, the result might be either chaos and an upsurge in violent conflict, with no protection for even tangible American interests in the world, and with failed states offering a breeding ground for terrorism against American society; or (almost conversely) the rise of one, or more, successor hegemons—either of which futures might be worse than an American attempt to preserve its determining, deterring, and mitigating control. The exponents of an absolute non-interventionist foreign and military policy for the United States may or may not be, in generalities, on the right side of the argument; but theirs is not an argument that is indisputable or beyond rebuttal. And the interventionist alternative, even in its starkest form, of unilateral military action and the preemptive use of force—is not, on its face, or even after some examination, simply dismissible. I would not be overly sanguine about any alleged invulnerability that America might achieve through retrenchment and restraint. And I would not “give much” for the putative cultural admiration, or moral sympathy, that America might thereby regain. It is likely that radical Islamist movements will continue to capture strategically potent sectors of the Muslim world, to enjoy the balance of sympathy of the larger Muslim populace, and to be implacably bent on inflicting heavy and frightening damage on American and other Western societies—as well as, of course, decisively intimidating the United States, or any other country, from coming to the assistance of Israel in any future terminal move against that country. Even a consistent, wholesale strategy of disengagement would not absolve America from terrorist attack, and thus from the necessity of providing, at continuing high cost, large, varied, and competent military forces, in an active status, and with ready means of deployment and logistics; nor would it spare America the political mobilization required to interdict and suppress terrorism by means of the surveillance and monitoring of entry, movement, communications, and many kinds of transactions.

#### Realism is inevitable

Guzzini**,** - Senior Research Fellow at the Copenhagen Peace Research Institute and Associate Professor of Political Science, International Relations, and European Studies at the Central European University in Budapest, 1998 (Stefano, Realism in International Relations, p. 212)

Therefore, in a third step, this chapter also claims that it is impossible just to heap realism onto the dustbin of history and start anew. This is a non-option. Although realism as a strictly causal theory has been a disappointment, various realist assumptions are well alive in the minds of many practitioners and observers of international affairs. Although it does not correspond to a theory which helps us to understand a real world with objective laws, it is a world-view which suggests thoughts about it, and which permeates our daily language for making sense of it. Realism has been a rich, albeit very contestable, reservoir of lessons of the past, of metaphors and historical analogies, which, in the hands of its most gifted representatives, have been proposed, at times imposed, and reproduced as guides to a common understanding of international affairs. Realism is alive in the collective memory and self-understanding of our (i.e. Western) foreign policy elite and public whether educated or not. Hence, we cannot but deal with it. For this reason, forgetting realism is also questionable. Of course, academic observers should not bow to the whims of daily politics. But staying at distance, or being critical, does not mean that they should lose the capacity to understand the languages of those who make significant decisions not only in government, but also in firms, NGOs, and other institutions. To the contrary, this understanding, as increasingly varied as it may be, is a prerequisite for their very profession. More particularly, it is a prerequisite for opposing the more irresponsible claims made in the name although not always necessarily in the spirit, of realism.

### Realism - Fill In DA

#### The K allows a more oppressive form of realism to fill in.

Guzzini, ‘98

(Assistant International Affairs Professor – CEU, Realism in International Relations and the International Political Economy. Pg. 205

On the other hand, to dispose of realism because some of its versions have been proven empiri¬cally wrong, ahistorical, or logically incoherent, does not necessarily touch its role in the shared understandings of observers and practitioners of inter¬national affairs. Realist theories have a persisting power for constructing our understanding of the present. Their assumptions, both as theoretical constructs, and as particular lessons of the past translated from one generation of decision-makers to another, help mobilizing certain understandings and dispositions to action. They also provide them with legitimacy. Despite realism’s several deaths as a general causal theory, it can still powerfully enframe action. It exists in the minds, and is hence reflected in the actions, of many practitioners. Whether or not the world realism depicts is out there, realism is. Realism is no a causal theory that explains International Relations, but as long as realism continues to be a powerful mind-set, we need to understand realism to make sense of International Relations. In other words, realism is a still necessary hermeneutical bridge to the understanding of world politics. Getting rid of realism without having a deep understanding of it, not only risks unwarranted dismissal of some valuable theoretical insights that I have tried to gather in this book; it would also be futile. Indeed, it might be the best way to tacitly and uncritically reproduce it.

#### Worst-case scenarios calculate for the sake of responsibility – mobilization is key to effective to political movements that prevent the worst forms of their impact

Michael Williams, Professor of International Politics – U. Wales, Aberystwyth**, ‘5**

(*The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations* p. 165-7)

Moreover, the links between sceptical realism and prevalent post-modern themes go more deeply than this, particularly as they apply to attempts by post-structural thinking to reopen questions of responsibility and ethics.80 In part, the goals of post-structural approaches can be usefully charactised, to borrow Stephen White’s illuminating contrast, as expressions of ‘responsibility to otherness’ which question and challenge modernist equations of responsibility with a ‘responsibility to act’. A responsibility to otherness seeks to reveal and open the constitutive processes and claims of subjects and subjectivities that a foundational modernism has effaced in its narrow identification of responsibility with a ‘responsibility to act’.81 Deconstruction can from this perspective be seen as a principled stance unwilling to succeumb to modernist essentialism which in the name of responsibility assumes and reifies subjects and structures, obscures forms of power and violence which are constitutive of them, and at the same time forecloses a consideration of alternative possibilities and practices. Yet it is my claim that the willful Realist tradition does not lack understanding of the contingency of practice or a vision of responsibility to otherness. On the contrary, its strategy of objectification is precisely an attempt to bring together a responsibility to otherness and a responsibility to act within a wilfully liberal vision. The construction of a realm of objectivity and calculation is not just a consequence of a need to act – the framing of an epistemic context for successful calculation. It is a form of responsibility to otherness, an attempt to allow for diversity and irreconcilability precisely by – at least initially – reducing the self and the other to a structure of material calculation in order to allow a structure of mutual intelligibility, mediation, and stability. It is, in short, a strategy of *limitation*: a wilful attempt to construct a subject and a social world limited – both epistemically and politically – in the name of a politics of toleration: a liberal strategy that John Gray has recently characterized as one of *modus vivendi*.82 If this is the case, then the deconstructive move that gains some of its weight by contrasting itself to a non- or apolitical objectivism must engage with the more complex contrast to a sceptical Realist tradition that is itself a constructed, ethical practice. This issue becomes even more acute if one considers Iver Neumann’s incisive questions concerning postmodern constructions of identity, action, and responsibility.83 As Neumann points out, the insight that identities are inescapably contingent and relationally constructed, and even the claim that identities are inescapably *indebted* to otherness, do not in themselves provide a foundation for practice, particularly in situations where identities are ‘sedimented’ and conflictually defined. In these cases, deconstruction alone will not suffice unless it can demonstrate a capacity to counter in practice and not just in philosophic practice the essentialist dynamics it confronts.84 Here, a responsibility to act must go **beyond** **deconstruction** to consider viable alternatives and counter-practices. To take this critique seriously is not necessarily to be subject yet again to the straightforward ‘blackmail of the Englightenment and a narrow ‘modernist’ vision of responsibility.85 While an unwillingness to move beyond a deconstructive ethic of responsibility to otherness for fear that an essentialist stance is the only (or most likely) alternative expresses a legitimate concern, it should not license a retreat from such questions or their practical demands. Rather, such situations demand also an evaluation of the structures (of identity and institutions) that might viably be mobilized in order to offset the worst implications of violently exclusionary identities. It requires, as Neumann nicely puts it, the generation of compelling ‘as if’ stories around which counter-subjectivities and political practices can coalesce. Wilful Realism, I submit, arises out of an appreciation of these issues, and comprises an attempt to craft precisely such ‘stories’ within a broader intellectual and sociological analysis of their conditions of production, possibilities of success, and likely consequences. The question is, to what extent are these limits capable of success, and to what extent might they be limits upon their own aspirations toward responsibility? These are crucial questions, but they will not be addressed by retreating yet again into further reversals of the same old dicohotomies.

### Science/Reason Good

#### Science and reason are good – key to progressive politics and stopping oppression – turns the K.

Alan Sokal, Professor of Physics at New York University, 1996 (“A Plea for Reason, Evidence and Logic,” Talk Presented at a Forum at New York University, October 26th, Available Online at http://www.physics.nyu.edu/faculty/sokal/nyu\_forum.html, Accessed 07-31-2010)

I didn't write the parody for the reasons you might at first think. My aim wasn't to defend science from the barbarian hordes of lit crit or sociology. I know perfectly well that the main threats to science nowadays come from budget-cutting politicians and corporate executives, not from a handful of postmodernist academics. Rather, my goal is to defend what one might call a scientific worldview -- defined broadly as a respect for evidence and logic, and for the incessant confrontation of theories with the real world; in short, for reasoned argument over wishful thinking, superstition and demagoguery. And my motives for trying to defend these old-fashioned ideas are basically political. I'm worried about trends in the American Left -- particularly here in academia -- that at a minimum divert us from the task of formulating a progressive social critique, by leading smart and committed people into trendy but ultimately empty intellectual fashions, and that can in fact undermine the prospects for such a critique, by promoting subjectivist and relativist philosophies that in my view are inconsistent with producing a realistic analysis of society that we and our fellow citizens will find compelling. David Whiteis, in a recent article, said it well: Too many academics, secure in their ivory towers and insulated from the real-world consequences of the ideas they espouse, seem blind to the fact that non-rationality has historically been among the most powerful weapons in the ideological arsenals of oppressors. The hypersubjectivity that characterizes postmodernism is a perfect case in point: far from being a legacy of leftist iconoclasm, as some of its advocates so disingenuously claim, it in fact ... plays perfectly into the anti-rationalist -- really, anti-thinking -- bias that currently infects "mainstream" U.S. culture. Along similar lines, the philosopher of science Larry Laudan observed caustically that the displacement of the idea that facts and evidence matter by the idea that everything boils down to subjective interests and perspectives is -- second only to American political campaigns -- the most prominent and pernicious manifestation of anti-intellectualism in our time.

#### The impact is extinction

Krauthammer 2011

<Charles,  Pulitzer Prize–winning syndicated columnist, political commentator, and physician. His weekly column appears in The Washington Post and is syndicated to more than 275 newspapers and media outlets.[1] He is a contributing editor to the Weekly Standard and The New Republic. He is also a weekly panelist on the PBS news program Inside Washington[2] and a nightly panelist on Fox News's Special Report with Bret Baier,  Are we alone in the universe?,  Dec 30, 2011 @ 03:19 PM, The Washington Post>

Rather than despair, however, let’s put the most hopeful face on the cosmic silence and on humanity’s own short, already baleful history with its new Promethean powers: Intelligence is a capacity so godlike, so protean that it must be contained and disciplined. This is the work of politics — understood as the ordering of society and the regulation of power to permit human flourishing while simultaneously restraining the most Hobbesian human instincts. There could be no greater irony: For all the sublimity of art, physics, music, mathematics and other manifestations of human genius, everything depends on the mundane, frustrating, often debased vocation known as politics (and its most exacting subspecialty — statecraft). **Because if we don’t get politics right, everything else risks extinction.** We grow justly weary of our politics. But we must remember this: Politics — in all its grubby, grasping, corrupt, contemptible manifestations — is sovereign in human affairs.Everything ultimately rests upon it. Fairly or not, politics is the driver of history. It will determine whether we will live long enough to be heard one day. Out there. By them, the few — the only — who got it right.

#### Life should be valued as apriori – it precedes the ability to value anything else

Amien Kacou. 2008. WHY EVEN MIND? On The A Priori Value Of “Life”, Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy, Vol 4, No 1-2 (2008) cosmosandhistory.org/index.php/journal/article/view/92/184

Furthermore, that manner of finding things good that is in pleasure can certainly not exist in any world without consciousness (i.e., without “life,” as we now understand the word)—slight analogies put aside. In fact, we can begin to develop a more sophisticated definition of the concept of “pleasure,” in the broadest possible sense of the word, as follows: it is the common psychological element in all psychological experience of goodness (be it in joy, admiration, or whatever else). In this sense, pleasure can always be pictured to “mediate” all awareness or perception or judgment of goodness: there is pleasure in all consciousness of things good; pleasure is the common element of all conscious satisfaction. In short, it is simply the very experience of liking things, or the liking of experience, in general. In this sense, pleasure is, not only uniquely characteristic of life but also, the core expression of goodness in life—the most general sign or phenomenon for favorable conscious valuation, in other words. This does not mean that “good” is absolutely synonymous with “pleasant”—what we value may well go beyond pleasure. (The fact that we value things needs not be reduced to the experience of liking things.) However, what we value beyond pleasure remains a matter of speculation or theory. Moreover, we note that a variety of things that may seem otherwise unrelated are correlated with pleasure—some more strongly than others. In other words, there are many things the experience of which we like. For example: the admiration of others; sex; or rock-paper-scissors. But, again, what they are is irrelevant in an inquiry on a priori value—what gives us pleasure is a matter for empirical investigation. Thus, we can see now that, in general, something primitively valuable is attainable in living—that is, pleasure itself. And it seems equally clear that we have a priori logical reason to pay attention to the world in any world where pleasure exists. Moreover, we can now also articulate a foundation for a security interest in our life: since the good of pleasure can be found in living (to the extent pleasure remains attainable),[17] and only in living, therefore, a priori, life ought to be continuously (and indefinitely) pursued at least for the sake of preserving the possibility of finding that good. However, this platitude about the value that can be found in life turns out to be, at this point, insufficient for our purposes. It seems to amount to very little more than recognizing that our subjective desire for life in and of itself shows that life has some objective value. For what difference is there between saying, “living is unique in benefiting something I value (namely, my pleasure); therefore, I should desire to go on living,” and saying, “I have a unique desire to go on living; therefore I should have a desire to go on living,” whereas the latter proposition immediately seems senseless? In other words, “life gives me pleasure,” says little more than, “I like life.” Thus, we seem to have arrived at the conclusion that the fact that we already have some (subjective) desire for life shows life to have some (objective) value. But, if that is the most we can say, then it seems our enterprise of justification was quite superficial, and the subjective/objective distinction was useless—for all we have really done is highlight the correspondence between value and desire. Perhaps, our inquiry should be a bit more complex.

#### Existence precedes the ability to ascribe value [and respect the other]

Paul Wapner. 2003. Associate Prof. and Dir. Global Env’t. Policy Prog. – American U., Dissent, “Leftist criticism of “nature””, Winter, 50:1.

All attempts to listen to nature are social constructions--except one. Even the most radical postmodernist must acknowledge the distinction between physical existence and nonexistence. As I have said, postmodernists accept that there is a physical substratum to the phenomenal world even if they argue about the different meanings we ascribe to it. This acknowledgment of physical existence is crucial. We can't ascribe meaning to that which doesn't appear. What doesn't exist can manifest no character. Put differently, yes, the postmodernist should rightly worry about interpreting nature's expressions. And all of us should be wary of those who claim to speak on nature's behalf (including environmentalists who do that). But we need not doubt the simple idea that a prerequisite of expression is existence. This in turn suggests that preserving the nonhuman world-in all its diverse embodiments-must be seen by eco-critics as a fundamental good. Eco-critics must be supporters, in some fashion, of environmental preservation. Postmodernists reject the idea of a universal good. They rightly acknowledge the difficulty of identifying a common value given the multiple contexts of our value-producing activity. In fact, if there is one thing they vehemently scorn, it is the idea that there can be a value that stands above the individual contexts of human experience. Such a value would present itself as a metanarrative and, as Jean Francois Lyotard has explained, postmodernism is characterized fundamentally by its "incredulity toward meta-narratives." Nonetheless, I can't see how postmodern critics can do otherwise than accept the value of preserving the nonhuman world. The nonhuman is the extreme "other"; it stands in contradistinction to humans as a species. In understanding the constructed quality of human experience and the dangers of reification, postmodernism inherently advances an ethic of respecting the "other." At the very least, respect must involve ensuring that the "other" actually continues to exist. In our day and age, this requires us to take responsibility for protecting the actuality of the nonhuman. Instead, however, we are running roughshod over the earth's diversity of plants, animals, and ecosystems. Postmodern critics should find this particularly disturbing. If they don't, they deny their own intellectual insights and compromise their fundamental moral commitment.

#### War fuels structural violence, not the other way around

Goldstein 2001. IR professor at American University (Joshua, War and Gender, p. 412, Google Books)

First, peace activists face a dilemma in thinking about causes of war and working for peace. Many peace scholars and activists support the approach, “if you want peace, work for justice.” Then, if one believes that sexism contributes to war, one can work for gender justice specifically (perhaps. among others) in order to pursue peace. This approach brings strategic allies to the peace movement (women, labor, minorities), but rests on the assumption that injustices cause war. The evidence in this book suggests that causality runs at least as strongly the other way. War is not a product of capitalism, imperialism, gender, innate aggression, or any other single cause, although all of these influence wars’ outbreaks and outcomes. Rather, war has in part fueled and sustained these and other injustices.9 So, “if you want peace, work for peace.” Indeed, if you want justice (gender and others), work for peace. Causality does not run just upward through the levels of analysis, from types of individuals, societies, and governments up to war. It runs downward too. Enloe suggests that changes in attitudes towards war and the military may be the most important way to “reverse women’s oppression.” The dilemma is that peace work focused on justice brings to the peace movement energy, allies, and moral grounding, yet, in light of this book’s evidence, the emphasis on injustice as the main cause of war seems to be empirically inadequate.

### At: Value to Life Impacts

#### Value to life should be individually determined – their impact claims invalidate personal autonomy

SCHWARTZ, HENDRY, & PREECE 2004 Professional Metaphysician, Senior Lecturer, General Practicianer Professor, Academic Surgeon [“Medical Ethics: A case based approach,” Lisa, Paul, and Robert]

Those who choose to reason on this basis hope that if the quality of a life can be measured then the answer to whether that life has value to the individual can be determined easily. This raises special problems, however, because the idea of quality involves a value judgement, and value judgements are, by their essence, subject to indeterminate relative factors such as preferences and dislikes. Hence, quality of life is difficult to measure and will vary according to individual tastes, preferences and aspirations. As a result, no general rules or principles can be asserted that would simplify decisions about the value of a life based on its quality. Nevertheless, quality is still an essential criterion in making such decisions because it gives legitimacy to the possibility that rational, autonomous persons can decide for themselves that their own lives either are worth, or are no longer worth, living. To disregard this possibility would be to imply that no individuals can legitimately make such value judgements about their own lives and, if nothing else, that would be counterintuitive. 2 In our case, Katherine Lewis had spent 10 months considering her decision before concluding that her life was no longer of a tolerable quality. She put a great deal of effort into the decision and she was competent when she made it. Who would be better placed to make this judgement for her than Katherine herself? And yet, a doctor faced with her request would most likely be uncertain about whether Katherine's choice is truly in her best interest, and feel trepidation about assisting her. We need to know which considerations can be used to protect the patient's interests. The quality of life criterion asserts that there is a difference between the type of life and the fact of life. This is the primary difference between it and the sanctity criterion discussed on page 115. Among quality of life considerations rest three assertions: 1. there is relative value to life 2. the value of a life is determined subjectively 3. not all lives are of equal value. Relative value The first assertion, that life is of relative value, could be taken in two ways. In one sense, it could mean that the value of a given life can be placed on a scale and measured against other lives. The scale could be a social scale, for example, where the contributions or potential for contribution of individuals are measured against those of fellow citizens. Critics of quality of life criteria frequently name this as a potential slippery slope where lives would be deemed worthy of saving, or even not saving, based on the relative social value of the individual concerned. So, for example, a mother of four children who is a practising doctor could be regarded of greater value to the community than an unmarried accountant. The concern is that the potential for discrimination is too high. Because of the possibility of prejudice and injustice, supporters of the quality of life criterion reject this interpersonal construction in favour of a second, more personalized, option. According to this interpretation, the notion of relative value is relevant not between individuals but within the context of one person's life and is measured against that person's needs and aspirations. So Katherine would base her decision on a comparison between her life before and after her illness. The value placed on the quality of a life would be determined by the individual depending on whether he or she believes the current state to be relatively preferable to previous or future states and whether he or she can foresee controlling the circumstances that make it that way. Thus, the life of an athlete who aspires to participate in the Olympics can be changed in relative value by an accident that leaves that person a quadriplegic. The athlete might decide that the relative value of her life is diminished after the accident, because she perceives her desires and aspirations to be reduced or beyond her capacity to control. However, if she receives treatment and counselling her aspirations could change and, with the adjustment, she could learn to value her life as a quadriplegic as much or more than her previous life. This illustrates how it is possible for a person to adjust the values by which they appraise their lives. For Katherine Lewis, the decision went the opposite way and she decided that a life of incapacity and constant pain was of relatively low value to her. It is not surprising that the most vociferous protesters against permitting people in Katherine's position to be assisted in terminating their lives are people who themselves are disabled. Organizations run by, and that represent, persons with disabilities make two assertions in this light. First, they claim that accepting that Katherine Lewis has a right to die based on her determination that her life is of relatively little value is demeaning to all disabled people, and implies that any life with a severe disability is not worth living. Their second assertion is that with proper help, over time Katherine would be able to transform her personal outlook and find satisfaction in her life that would increase its relative value for her. The first assertion can be addressed by clarifying that the case of Katherine Lewis must not be taken as a general rule. Deontologists, who are interested in knowing general principles and duties that can be applied across all cases would not be very satisfied with this; they would prefer to be able to look to duties that would apply in all cases. Here, a case-based, context-sensitive approach is better suited. Contextualizing would permit freedom to act within a particular context, without the implication that the decision must hold in general. So, in this case, Katherine might decide that her life is relatively valueless. In another case, for example that of actor Christopher Reeve, the decision to seek other ways of valuing this major life change led to him perceiving his life as highly valuable, even if different in value from before the accident that made him a paraplegic. This invokes the second assertion, that Katherine could change her view over time. Although we recognize this is possible in some cases, it is not clear how it applies to Katherine. Here we have a case in which a rational and competent person has had time to consider her options and has chosen to end her life of suffering beyond what she believes she can endure. Ten months is a long time and it will have given her plenty of opportunity to consult with family and professionals about the possibilities open to her in the future. Given all this, it is reasonable to assume that Katherine has made a well-reasoned decision. It might not be a decision that everyone can agree with but if her reasoning process can be called into question then at what point can we say that a decision is sound? She meets all the criteria for competence and she is aware of the consequences of her decision. It would be very difficult to determine what arguments could truly justify interfering with her choice. Subjective determination The second assertion made by supporters of the quality of life as a criterion for decisionmaking is closely related to the first, but with an added dimension. This assertion suggests that the determination of the value of the quality of a given life is a subjective determination to be made by the person experiencing that life. The important addition here is that the decision is a personal one that, ideally, ought not to be made externally by another person but internally by the individual involved. Katherine Lewis made this decision for herself based on a comparison between two stages of her life. So did James Brady. Without this element, decisions based on quality of life criteria lack salient information and the patients concerned cannot give informed consent. Patients must be given the opportunity to decide for themselves whether they think their lives are worth living or not. To ignore or overlook patients' judgement in this matter is to violate their autonomy and their freedom to decide for themselves on the basis of relevant information about their future, and comparative consideration of their past. As the deontological position puts it so well, to do so is to violate the imperative that we must treat persons as rational and as ends in themselves.

#### Empirically denied – no root cause of war

Greg Cashman. 2000. Professor of Political Science at Salisbury State University “What Causes war?: An introduction to theories of international conflict” pg. 9

Two warnings need to be issued at this point. First, while we have been using a single variable explanation of war merely for the sake of simplicity, multivariate explanations of war are likely to be much more powerful. Since social and political behaviors are extremely complex, they are almost never explainable through a single factor. Decades of research have led most analysts to reject monocausal explanations of war. For instance, international relations theorist J. David Singer suggests that we ought to move away from the concept of “causality” since it has become associated with the search for a single cause of war; we should instead redirect our activities toward discovering “explanations”—a term that implies multiple causes of war, but also a certain element of randomness or chance in their occurrence.

### Shell Card

#### Obama will win- Polls and economic rebound

Cook 9-22

Charlie is the director of the Cook Political Report and a Columnist for National Journal, “Obama’s Uptick,” <http://nationaljournal.com/columns/cook-report/the-cook-report-obama-s-uptick-20120920>

Reality is often more complicated than conventional wisdom would have you believe, a point underscored in the latest NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll. The survey showed President Obama with a 6-point lead among all registered voters, a 7-point edge among registered voters in 12 swing states, and a 5-point advantage among likely voters nationally. The Obama lead in the survey, no matter which set of numbers you focus on, is wider than in many other public polls, including the widely watched automated robo-polls, which are not allowed to dial cell phones. Such robo-polls miss entirely the 30 to 40 percent of the electorate who don’t have land-line phones or rarely use them. The robo-polls rely on respondents who are not representative of the broader public and undercount young and minority voters, who are more likely than other demographic groups to have only cell phones.¶ As widely different as the NBC/WSJ poll is from many other public polls, the numbers are very close to the 4- or 5-point Obama lead I have been picking up in recent days from top pollsters and strategists from both parties. Of course, this shouldn’t be too much of a shocker, as the NBC/WSJ poll is conducted jointly by Peter Hart, the preeminent Democratic pollster (although Hart no longer does political campaigns), and Bill McInturff, a founder and partner of Public Opinion Strategies, a highly respected Republican polling firm.¶ To be sure, other highly regarded polls showed Obama with a smaller lead. The Gallup tracking poll conducted Sept. 11-17 had the race narrowing to a single point, 47 percent to 46 percent, down from a 3-point Obama lead from the two previous days, and a separate Sept. 11-17 Gallup poll in 12 swing states showed Obama up by 2 points, 48 percent to 46 percent. The most recent CBS News/New York Times national poll put the Obama edge at 3 points, 49 percent to 46 percent. Fox News had it at 5 points, 48 percent to 43 percent. The debate is over the margin, not over who is ahead.¶ There has been a lot of news in the past few weeks with the potential to affect the presidential race, including the party conventions and the anti-American violence in the Middle East. Obama’s job-approval rating in the Hart/McInturff survey, conducted Sept. 12-16 among 900 registered voters (including 270 cell-phone-only respondents), ticked up by 2 points since the August survey, from 48 percent to 50 percent, with his disapproval number dropping by a point to 48 percent. Not a big shift, but if you are an incumbent seeking reelection, it’s nice to have a job-approval rating of 50 percent or higher.¶ Three sets of numbers in other questions might explain the uptick. In the key “right direction/wrong track” question, called the “Dow Jones indicator of American politics” by the late Dick Wirthlin, President Reagan’s pollster, the “right direction” jumped up 7 points since August, from 32 percent to 39 percent; the “wrong track” dropped 6 points, from 61 percent to 55 percent. Obama’s job approval on handling the economy ticked up 3 points to 47 percent, while disapproval dropped 3 points, to 51 percent, perhaps driven by stock-market gains and more optimism about housing. In other words, Obama went from a net minus 10 points in August to a net minus 4 points in September. When asked, “During the next 12 months, do you think that the nation’s economy will get better, get worse, or stay about the same?” the percentage of respondents saying they expected the economy to get better increased 6 points, to 42 percent; the “get worse” remained the same at 18 percent; and the share saying “stay about the same” declined to 32 percent. In another question, 51 percent said they thought that the economy is recovering (up a point from August) and those saying that it isn’t dropped a point, so the net responses citing economic recovery shifted slightly from a net 4 to a net 6 points. These aren’t big changes, but they are an improvement on what had been Obama’s biggest liability: the state of the economy and the public’s perception of his stewardship of it.¶ While all of this modestly good news for the president was occurring, however, his approval rating on handling foreign policy dropped 5 points in a month, from 54 percent to 49 percent, with his disapproval number rising from 40 percent to 46 percent. Clearly, what is happening abroad is making an impression on voters, but it is being offset by a cautiously improving view of where the country and economy are going.¶ Central to Mitt Romney’s challenge is that too many Americans either don’t like him or can’t figure out if they do. Only 38 percent of registered voters had a positive view of Romney (the same as last month), while 43 percent had a negative view, 1 point down from August. Romney’s underwater ratings—minus 6 points in August, minus 5 points in September—compare with Obama being plus 5 points in August and plus 6 points this month.¶ Equally dispiriting for Republicans are the responses to questions about which candidate would be better in dealing with three subjects: Medicare, taxes, and the economy. On Medicare, 47 percent said that Obama would be better, while 37 percent chose Romney. On taxes, Obama had a 6-point edge, 45 percent to 39 percent. And on the economy, the two men are now tied at 43 percent, compared with a 6-point Romney edge in July.¶ With six weeks to go before the election, this contest is certainly not over. But it is becoming increasingly clear that Romney needs something to happen to change the trajectory of this race. Right now, it isn’t heading in a good direction for him.

#### Long timeframe for relations good impacts

Hart and Simes 09

Gary Hart is the Wirth Chair at the University of Colorado at Denver and is also a former Democratic U.S. senator from Colorado. Dmitri K. Simes is the publisher of The National Interest “The Road to Moscow.” National Interest, 08849382, May/Jun2009, Issue 101

Even the best American strategy is unlikely to produce breakthroughs .or the sudden transformation of our current near rivalry into a beautiful friendship. But pretending to cooperate with Russia, as we have done for almost two decades, is not a responsible course in the current troubled world. Especially if the help we need from Moscow on America's national-security priorities is not make-believe, but real.

#### Offense goes one direction- Russia will escalate disputes and won’t cooperate

#### Hart and Simes 09

Gary Hart is the Wirth Chair at the University of Colorado at Denver and is also a former Democratic U.S. senator from Colorado. Dmitri K. Simes is the publisher of The National Interest “The Road to Moscow.” National Interest, 08849382, May/Jun2009, Issue 101

As a result, two U.S. administrations in a row took it upon themselves to tell Russia what its national interests were. And we did not just lecture Russia, we assumed that Russian policy makers would take our lectures seriously and follow our guidance. Because it was heavily dependent upon the International Monetary Fund and other foreign creditors, Boris Yeltsin's Russia often complained about U.S. disregard for Russian positions and engaged in saber rattling--like the seizure of Pristina's airport during NATO's 1999 war on Yugoslavia over Kosovo--but ultimately never offered real opposition to U.S. policies. Still, the American approach won no favor in Moscow and strengthened nationalist trends in Russian politics. Once the Russian economy became more self-sufficient, largely due to high energy prices, Vladimir Putin's leadership displayed a new assertiveness and even defiance toward Washington. Perhaps unsurprisingly in view of Russian history, today's more confident Moscow often overreacts and overplays its hand, exacerbating almost any dispute it enters. As a result, even when Russia has an arguably legitimate case, like when Georgian forces attacked Russian peacekeepers in South Ossetia in August 2008 or when Ukraine failed to pay its debts to Gazprom, Russian public diplomacy often suffers from exaggerated, haughty and dismissive rhetoric that undermines Moscow's positions and rubs many the wrong way. Still, Russia feels fully capable of defining its own interests and has little tolerance for lectures from Washington--or from anywhere else for that matter. Thus, anyone who wants to do business with Russia, and most importantly to get results, would do well to start by accepting Russian interests as Russians themselves define them.

### Russia-China Trade-off Turn

#### US-Russian relations divide Russia and China

BBC Monitoring ‘9

[BBC Monitoring Asia Pacific - Political Supplied by BBC Worldwide Monitoring July 10, 2009 “Turkish columnist does not rule out Xinjiang scenario in India” Yeni Safak website, Istanbul, in Turkish 9 Jul 09]

3-How will US-Russian relations impact China? That the crisis coincided with the period of Barack Obama's Moscow visit, which is an indication of the efforts at "rapprochement" between the United States and Russia, is just as noteworthy. In addition to the traditional cooperation and agreements between the two countries, Russia has opened up its territory for the great operation that the United States is going to launch in Afghanistan. This was an astonishing development. After Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan as well wanted to close the US bases in the region, but Bishkek was persuaded in the past few days, while Tajikistan rented, at the last moment, the military base that had been expected to be provided to Russia. Obama's visit was aimed at breaking the Russia-China alliance, neutralizing the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, isolating Iran, and seeking regional support for the Afghanistan/Pakistan operation. The real intent behind the US President's speech in Moscow, following those in Ankara and Cairo, and his uttering of words as if he were some ambassador of peace, is slowly emerging. Washington is trying to move towards a new world design based on Obama's words. Even if the weak position the United States is currently in make this goal unclear, it seems that Obama will display the most momentous impacts of the period in Asia. 4-Might similar clashes erupt in India as well? There is an allegation as follows: It is being claimed that the United States, which with Obama's messages of peace to the Islamic world is seeking to take a new direction, and various other circles, are looking at the problems and vulnerabilities of countries that have Muslim minorities, that they are focusing in particular on China and India, that these countries will be squeezed into a corner on the basis of their Muslim minorities, and that the countries in question will be turned into the new enemies of the Islamic world... If this is the case, it means that a new threat will be marketed to Asian powers, who are in places cooperating against the West. It is being said that consideration is being given to events similar to those taking place in East Turkistan occurring in India as well. It would be useful to follow developments relating to this allegation closely. 5-Why is the crisis shifting from the Middle East to Asia? The geopolitical and economic war between the central powers of the West and the East is gradually escalating. In parallel with this, the crisis centred in the Middle East today is shifting towards the East. The things now taking place in the East, the alliances and hostilities in the East, will become clearer. We know that the United States is speeding up its withdrawal out of the region around Iran, that it is once again putting the nuclear threat into the foreground, and that it is making preparations for a global crisis centred on Afghanistan and Pakistan. Thus it is useful to follow US-Russian relations closely. The course of this relationship will not only determine the course of the crises in the region, but could also to a large degree weaken the alliances in Asia.

#### That triggers Russia-China border wars- US relations is the key signal

Yuan ‘11

[Dr. Jingdong Yuan is an associate professor at the Centre for International Security Studies, University of Sydney. <http://www.jamestown.org/programs/chinabrief/single/?tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=38473&cHash=695e50ad359f9a76d1a0512ba465d0bd> ETB]

In recent years, however, Chinese interests have shifted from purchases of off-the-shelf weapons systems to acquisition of military technologies, joint development and license production. Bilateral arms trade volumes subsequently have declined. Russia has been cautious in expanding bilateral military cooperation beyond arms sales for fear of future competition from Chinese defense industry in the international market. The more important reason however may be Russia’s concern over the rise of China. Indeed, Chinese analysts have pointed to Russia’s growing military deployment in the Far East in recent years, including tactical nuclear weapons, in preparation for future unspecified contingencies [4]. Meanwhile, Russia has been willing to sell advanced weapons systems to India and Vietnam, and is pushing for increased arms sales to some Southeast Asian countries (Global Times, August 31). For two large continental countries sharing a strategic partnership, bilateral economic ties have remained underdeveloped. Sino-Russian trade, at around $55.4 billion in 2010, trails behind most of China’s other key trading partners. Bilateral investments are appallingly low with accumulated Chinese direct investment in Russia at $2 billion by 2009. Chinese businessmen complain about the Russian investment environment and wide-spread corruption among officials as major impediments, while Moscow charges China with dumping low-quality consumer goods and other illicit trading practices. It is clear that Russia is unwilling to become a supplier of raw materials and energy to China while Chinese products swamp its market (China Daily, April 13; Richard Weitz, “China-Russia Relations and the United States: At a Turning Point?” Second Line of Defense, April 12, 2011). This may explain the slow pace of and Chinese frustration with energy cooperation over the past decade. Different expectations, disputes over costs and pricing and Russia’s opportunistic pursuit of its energy leverage have led to repeated delays and unfulfilled promises. On the one hand, Moscow is averse to becoming an energy appendage to China; on the other hand, rising price in oil provides Russia with huge revenues and enhances its bargaining power vis-à-vis energy importing countries, including China. The drawn-out negotiation over and the constant changes in the construction of the Angarsk-Daqing pipeline have both raised the costs and lowered the confidence in Sino-Russian energy cooperation. Chinese oil companies have faced barriers in investing in Russia’s energy sector and Moscow has not reacted positively to Chinese energy cooperation with Central Asian countries such as Turkmenistan and Kazakhstan. Bilateral talks on Russian supply of natural gas to China have been dragging for over a decade without closing the deal. Chinese media suggests Gazprom seeks $40 billion in advance prepayment for Russian guarantee of a 30-year supply of natural gas to China (Global Times, August 19) [5]. Strategic Partnership in the Next Decade Marking two important anniversaries in 2011, Chinese and Russian leaders recognize the value of their strategic partnership even though their respective interests and priorities sometimes take precedence over their taunted friendship. Overall, however, the relationship however remains positive and the institutional foundation developed over the years will provide Beijing and Moscow the necessary compass and sufficient incentives to strengthen cooperation on a number of fronts. China will continue to value a stable Sino-Russian relationship and promote closer partnership where both countries will benefit. On the strategic front, maintaining the over 4,000-kilometer border peacefully and keeping a friendly neighbor has been one of the key diplomatic achievements Beijing has accomplished since the end of the Cold War. At the same time, working closely with Russia through the Shanghai Cooperation Organization allows China access to energy resources in Central Asia and to secure SCO member states’ support and collaboration in combating ethnic separatism in its remote northwestern region. Beijing has been attentive to developments in Russian-U.S. relations, especially in the wake of their “reset” and the conclusion of the New START Treaty on nuclear arms reduction as well as how these would affect China’s interests and the Sino-Russian strategic partnership. The Medvedev government is seeking to develop a closer relationship with the Obama administration and this policy orientation has already affected how Beijing and Moscow coordinate their approaches to issues ranging from Iran to Libya [6]. Managing Sino-Russian relations requires vision and forward-looking perspectives. Beijing recognizes Moscow’s nostalgia for its glorious past and its aspiration for playing an important role in both regional and global affairs, and has accorded due respect to its northern neighbor. Understandably, China’s phenomenal rise and demographic changes in the two countries also stoke Russian paranoia about an impending Chinese take-over of the Far East. Addressing these concerns requires not only closer dialogues between officials but also greater contacts and better understanding between the two peoples. China and Russia both recognize they need to do more to facilitate bilateral trade and encourage investment. Beijing and Moscow have set targets for achieving $100 billion and $200 billion in annual trade before 2015 and 2020, respectively. During his recent visit to Russia, Wu Bangguo, head of the Chinese National People’s Congress, put forth four proposals for deepening bilateral economic ties, including cooperation on energy, science and technology exchanges, and border region trade (People's Daily, September 15).

#### Causes extinction

**Sharavin 1** (Alexander, Russian Military Officer, 10-3, Defense and Security, Lexis)

Russia may face the "wonderful" prospect of combating the Chinese army, which, if full mobilization is called, is comparable in size with Russia's entire population, which also has nuclear weapons (even tactical weapons become strategic if states have common borders) and would be absolutely insensitive to losses (even a loss of a few million of the servicemen would be acceptable for China). Such a war would be more horrible than the World War II. It would require from our state maximal tension, universal mobilization and complete accumulation of the army military hardware, up to the last tank or a plane, in a single direction (we would have to forget such "trifles" like Talebs and Basaev, but this does not guarantee success either). Massive nuclear strikes on basic military forces and cities of China would finally be the only way out, what would exhaust Russia's armament completely. We have not got another set of intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-based missiles, whereas the general forces would be extremely exhausted in the border combats. In the long run, even if the aggression would be stopped after the majority of the Chinese are killed, our country would be absolutely unprotected against the "Chechen" and the "Balkan" variants both, and even against the first frost of a possible nuclear winter.