### Environment

**The insane amounts of abuse the environment has taken shows it won’t collapse**

**Easterbrook 95,** Distinguished Fellow, Fullbright Foundation (Gregg, A Moment on Earth pg 25)

IN THE AFTERMATH OF EVENTS SUCH AS LOVE CANAL OR THE Exxon Valdez oil spill, every reference to the environment is prefaced with the adjective "fragile." "Fragile environment" has become a welded phrase of the modern lexicon, like "aging hippie" or "fugitive financier." But the notion of a fragile environment is profoundly wrong. Individual animals, plants, and people are distressingly fragile. **The environment** that contains them **is** close to **indestructible.** The living environment of Earth has survived ice ages; bombardments of cosmic radiation more deadly than atomic fallout; solar radiation more powerful than the worst-case projection for ozone depletion; thousand-year periods of intense volcanism releasing global air pollution far worse than that made by any factory; reversals of the planet's magnetic poles; the rearrangement of continents; transformation of plains into mountain ranges and of seas into plains; fluctuations of ocean currents and the jet stream; 300-foot vacillations in sea levels; shortening and lengthening of the seasons caused by shifts in the planetary axis; collisions of asteroids and comets bearing far more force than man's nuclear arsenals; and the years without summer that followed these impacts. Yet hearts beat on, and petals unfold still. Were the environment fragile it would have expired many eons before the advent of the industrial affronts of the dreaming ape*.* Human assaults on the environment, though mischievous, are pinpricks compared to forces of the magnitude nature is accustomed to resisting.

**Ozone depletion inevitable**

**TIMES EDUCATIONAL SUPPLEMENT 1-16-2004**

Without this protection, there would be little life on Earth. So, ozone is formed by UV, destroyed by UV, and in the process it protects us from UV. What this means is that there is an "ozone balance" -a state in which ozone is being created and destroyed at equal rates -which keeps the ozone layer in being. The balance is naturally fragile and fluctuating, and anything that upsets it and increases the rate of ozone destruction is potentially life-threatening -hence the worry, since the 1980s, about the effect of the release into the atmosphere of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), such as those used in aerosols, refrigerators and air conditioners. These interfere with the ozone balance by promoting complex chemical reactions that speed up the breakdown of ozone. The problem is aggravated by the fact that CFCs were used for many years in the belief that they were inert, with no environmental penalties. Their very stability, however, means that even after they have been phased out, they will remain in the atmosphere for a long time.

**No impact to ozone**

**Singer 2002** (S. Fred, Prof. Emeritus Env. Sci. – U. Virginia, “Correct Lessons from Shrinking Ozone Hole”, http://www.heartland.org/policybot/results/10609/Correct\_Lessons\_from\_Shrinking\_Ozone\_Hole.html)

I agree with the title of your editorial ("The sky is not falling" Oct 12, 2002) but wish to correct some of the scientific information:\* The Antarctic Ozone Hole (AOH) was never "theorized" but discovered in 1985 and explained only much later;\* By 1987, when the Montreal Protocol (to phase out CFCs) was concluded, the published data showed no increase in stratospheric chlorine, an ozone-destroying chemical, and therefore no evidence for a human influence. In fact, the chief US negotiator Richard Benedick bragged that he was able to pull off the Montreal accord without any backing from science. I quote from his book Ozone Diplomacy: " Perhaps the most extraordinary aspect of the treaty was............[that it] rested on scientific theories rather than on firm data;"\* According to the official UN report of 2002, stratospheric chlorine is still rising. No matter: The size of the AOH has been controlled by changing weather patterns rather than by chlorine levels;\* In spite of theoretical predictions, there has been no direct observational evidence for a steady increase of ultraviolet radiation at the Earth's surface. Therefore all imagined impacts cited in the editorial -- skin cancers, cataracts, etc. -- are based on speculation.

**No impact or spillover to biodiversity**

**Ridder 2008** – PhD, School of Geography and Environmental Studies, University of Tasmania (Ben, Biodiversity And Conservation, 17.4, “Questioning the ecosystem services argument for biodiversity conservation”) \*ES = environmental services

The low resilience assumption

Advocates of the conservation of biodiversity tend not to acknowledge the distinction between resilient and sensitive ES. This ‘low resilience assumption’ gives rise to, and is reinforced by the almost ubiquitous claim within the conservation literature that ES depend on biodiversity.

An extreme example of this claim is made by the Ehrlichs in Extinction. They state that “all [ecosystem services] will be threatened if the rate of extinctions continues to increase” then observe that attempts to artificially replicate natural processes “are no more than partially successful in most cases. Nature nearly always does it better. When society sacrifices natural services for some other gain… it must pay the costs of substitution” (Ehrlich and Ehrlich 1982, pp. 95–96). This assertion—that the only alternative to protecting every species is a world in which all ES have been substituted by artificial alternatives—is an extreme example of the ‘low resilience assumption’. Paul Ehrlich revisits this flawed logic in 1997 i nhis response (with four co-authors) to doubts expressed by Mark Sagoff regarding economic arguments for species conservation (Ehrlich et al. 1997, p. 101).

The claim that ES depend on biodiversity is also notably present in the controversial Issues in Ecology paper on biodiversity and ecosystem functioning (Naeem et al. 1999) that sparked the debate mentioned in the introduction. This appears to reflect a general tendency among authors in this field (e.g., Hector et al. 2001; Lawler et al. 2002; Lyons et al. 2005). Although such authors may not actually articulate the low resilience assumption, presenting such claims in the absence of any clarification indicates its influence.

That the low resilience assumption is largely false is apparent in the number of examples of species extinctions that have not brought about catastrophic ecosystem collapse and decline in ES, and in the generally limited ecosystem influence of species on the cusp of extinction. These issues have been raised by numerous authors, although given the absence of systematic attempts to verify propositions of this sort, the evidence assembled is usually anecdotal and we are forced to trust that an unbiased account of the situation has been presented. Fortunately a number of highly respected people have discussed this topic, not least being the prominent conservation biologist David Ehrenfeld. In 1978 he described the ‘conservation dilemma’, which “arises on the increasingly frequent occasions when we encounter a threatened part of Nature but can find no rational reason for keeping it” (Ehrenfeld 1981, p. 177). He continued with the following observation:

Have there been permanent and significant ‘resource’ effects of the extinction, in the wild, of John Bartram’s great discovery, the beautiful tree Franklinia alatamaha, which had almost vanished from the earth when Bartram first set eyes upon it? Or a thousand species of tiny beetles that we never knew existed before or after their probable extermination? Can we even be certain than the eastern forests of the United States suffer the loss of their passenger pigeons and chestnuts in some tangible way that affects their vitality or permanence, their value to us? (p. 192)

Later, at the first conference on biodiversity, Ehrenfeld (1988) reflected that most species “do not seem to have any conventional value at all” and that the rarest species are “the ones least likely to be missed… by no stretch of the imagination can we make them out to be vital cogs in the ecological machine” (p. 215). The appearance of comments within the environmental literature that are consistent with Ehrenfeld’s—and from authors whose academic standing is also worthy of respect—is uncommon but not unheard of (e.g., Tudge 1989; Ghilarov 1996; Sagoff 1997; Slobodkin 2001; Western 2001).

The low resilience assumption is also undermined by the overwhelming tendency for the protection of specific endangered species to be justified by moral or aesthetic arguments, or a basic appeal to the necessity of conserving biodiversity, rather than by emphasising the actual ES these species provide or might be able to provide humanity. Often the only services that can be promoted in this regard relate to the ‘scientific’ or ‘cultural’ value of conserving a particular species, and the tourism revenue that might be associated with its continued existence. The preservation of such services is of an entirely different order compared with the collapse of human civilization predicted by the more pessimistic environmental authors.

The popularity of the low resilience assumption is in part explained by the increased rhetorical force of arguments that highlight connections between the conservation of biodiversity, human survival and economic profit. However, it needs to be acknowledged by those who employ this approach that a number of negative implications are associated with any use of economic arguments to justify the conservation of biodiversity.

**Too many alt causes**

**Pynn 7** (Larry, staff writer at The Vancouver Sun, “Global warming not biggest threat: expert,” The Vancouver Sun, http://www2.canada.com/vancouversun/news/story.html?id=6e2988da-31ab-4697-810d-7a008306d571&p=1)

"We all worry about climate change, as we should, but it doesn't mean we shouldn't worry about protecting habitat," says James Grant, a biology professor at Concordia University in Montreal and co-author of a new report on threats to endangered species in Canada. "The really immediate causes right now for many species are things like farming, urbanization and habitat loss caused by the direct things we do." Research by Grant and his pupils shows the biggest threat is habitat loss at 84 per cent, overexploitation 32 per cent, native species interactions 31 per cent, natural causes 27 per cent, pollution 26 per cent, and introduced species 22 per cent. On average, species are threatened by at least two of the six categories. Human activities representing the biggest source of habitat loss and pollution are not industrial resource extraction, but agriculture at 46 per cent and urbanization at 44 per cent. "Farming is huge," Grant said in an interview. "The Prairies are one of the most affected habitats in the world. We've turned them into wheat fields." The southern Okanagan-Similkameen is another example, home to about one-third of species at risk in B.C. as well as a thriving agricultural industry, including vineyards, and increased urban development.

### Environmental Leadership

#### You can’t solve environmental leadership—countries will be skeptical and reject any attempt to increase leadership

**Victor 8** - law professor at Stanford's Program on Energy and Sustainable Development and adjunct senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations.

(David G., "The next U.S. President won't be green", 5-1-08 <http://www.newsweek.com/id/135073/>)

The U.S. record on international environmental issues is highly uneven for reasons that have little to do with George W. Bush's leadership. His administration has been tarred across the planet for reckless leadership on international environmental issues. (Its actual record, while dreadful, is not a uniform failure. It has done useful things in a few areas, such as a thoughtful initiative to help conserve forests in the Congo Basin.) But the signature of Bush's reckless foreign policy in this area, his decision to withdraw from the Kyoto treaty barely three months after taking office, actually has its roots in the Clinton administration. Clinton was highly committed to environmental issues and his vice president, Al Gore, was an even more passionate leader. Their zealous diplomats negotiated a treaty that was larded with commitments that the United States never could have honored. The promise to cut U.S. emissions 7 percent below 1990 levels is a good example. Because actual emissions were rising steadily, it would have been impractical to turn them around in time to meet the 2012 Kyoto deadline. The U.S. Congress never could have passed the requisite legislation, and no leader in the White House could have changed that voting arithmetic. The U.S. withdrawal from the Kyoto Protocol was inevitable.

What does this mean for America's credibility in the world? When the American president promises, should anyone listen?

Increasingly, other countries are learning that the answer is no—because American leaders have a habit of promising a lot more than they can deliver. Environmental issues are particularly prone to overpromising, and not just by the United States. Europe, too, is fresh with unrealistic claims by political leaders. The European Union, for example, has launched negotiations for the post-Kyoto agreement by claiming that Europeans will cut greenhouse-gas emissions 20 percent to 30 percent by 2020—an outrageous goal considering that most of Europe (with the exception mainly of Britain and Germany) will fail to meet their existing targets, and emissions are actually rising. Europe as a whole would blow through its Kyoto targets if not for its generous use of a scheme that lets them take credit for overseas investment in low-carbon technologies—despite mounting evidence that many of those overseas credits don't actually deliver real reductions in emissions. Smart politicians know that the benefits lie mainly in the promising today and not in the delivery long in the future.

Ironically, the more enthusiastic the leader, the less credibility he or she has. While the Clinton administration was busy negotiating the Kyoto treaty, the U.S. Senate was passing a resolution, 95 to 0, to signal that it would reject any treaty that didn't contain specific commitments by developing countries to control their effluent of greenhouse gases. Since the developing countries had already rejected that outcome the Clinton administration had little room to maneuver. The great reversal in U.S. "leadership" on global warming over the last year—signaled by President Bush's speech three weeks ago embracing the need for limits on greenhouse gases—came from the people rather than top leaders. Public concern about global warming is rising (though it will be checked by the even more acute worries on the economy and war). The Bush speech was more a recognition that serious efforts to develop climate legislation are already well underway without his stamp. Many states are already planning to regulate greenhouse gases. The Senate has a serious bill on this subject scheduled for floor debate starting June 2. Its sponsors are Joe Lieberman (the former running mate of Al Gore but now alienated from the Democratic Party for his overly independent views) and John Warner (a Republican who has no former track record on global warming). These are ideal leaders for this issue because often it takes the fresh faces focused on building bipartisan majorities to get things done in America.

Perhaps the most interesting signal that American presidents are losing the ability to lead is an effort to rewrite the rules that would govern environmental treaties under American law. Committed environmentalists have rightly noted that America's Constitution requires a two-thirds vote for treaties in the Senate. That standard is nearly impossible to meet because one third of the Senate is usually opposed to anything interesting. Serious efforts are now underway to reinterpret environmental "treaties" as agreements between Congress and the president, which would require only a majority vote. Most trade agreements, for example, travel under this more lax standard and also have special voting rules that require Congress to approve the agreement as a whole package rather than pick it apart piece by piece. Rebranding and changing voting rules makes it easier to approve agreements, boosting the credibility of the president to negotiate agreements that serve the country's interest.

### Soft Power Diseases

**Extinction impossible and ahistorical**

**Posner 5** (Richard A., Judge U.S. Court of Appeals 7th Circuit, Professor Chicago School of Law, January 1, 2005, Skeptic, Altadena, CA, Catastrophe: Risk and Response, http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi\_0199-4150331/Catastrophe-the-dozen-most-significant.html#abstract)

Yet the fact that Homo sapiens has managed to survive every disease to assail it in the 200,000 years or so of its existence is a source of genuine comfort, at least if the focus is on extinction events. There have been enormously destructive plagues, such as the Black Death, smallpox, and now AIDS, but **none has come close** to destroying the entire human race. There is a biological reason. Natural selection favors germs of **limited lethality**; they are fitter in an evolutionary sense because their genes are more likely to be spread if the germs do not kill their hosts too quickly. The AIDS virus is an example of a lethal virus, wholly natural, that by lying dormant yet infectious in its host for years maximizes its spread. Yet there is no danger that AIDS will destroy the entire human race. The likelihood of a natural pandemic that would cause the extinction of the human race is probably even less today than in the past (except in prehistoric times, when people lived in small, scattered bands, which would have limited the spread of disease), despite wider human contacts that make it more difficult to localize an infectious disease. The reason is improvements in medical science. But the comfort is a small one. Pandemics can still impose enormous losses and resist prevention and cure: the lesson of the AIDS pandemic. And there is always a lust time. That the human race has not yet been destroyed by germs created or made more lethal by modern science, as distinct from completely natural disease agents such as the flu and AIDS viruses, is even less reassuring. We haven't had these products long enough to be able to infer survivability from our experience with them. A recent study suggests that as immunity to smallpox declines because people am no longer being vaccinated against it, monkeypox may evolve into "a successful human pathogen," (9) yet one that vaccination against smallpox would provide at least some protection against; and even before the discovery of the smallpox vaccine, smallpox did not wipe out the human race. What is new is the possibility that science, bypassing evolution, will enable monkeypox to be "juiced up" through gene splicing into a far more lethal pathogen than smallpox ever was.

### Soft Power Alt Causes

**Single reforms—soft power is doomed and their authors are clowns**

**Afrasiabi, 07 –** PhD and author on Iran (Kaveh, Asia Times, “The illusion of American 'smart power'”

http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle\_East/IK13Ak02.html)

Over the years, Nye has been anything but shy about claiming credit for his singular contributions to the theories of power, yet much of it is undeserved, as any competent sociologist probing the history of thoughts, running from Max Weber to Antonio Gramsci to Michel Foucault, regarding the subtleties and complexities of power, would readily attest. Nye's theory is an excellent theory that can never be refuted precisely because it cannot be pinned down, its core assumptions too nebulous to lend themselves to scientific parsimony.

Aside from contradictory notions and simplistic truisms, eg, "strengthen America" by "bolstering its soft power", the report is distinguished by its unabashed glorification of the American military - that has "never been put in the service of building a colonial empire in the manner of European militaries". A little micro-focusing on post September 11, 2001, American interventionism, curiously absent in the whole report, would arguably lead to a diametrically different conclusion. Too much focus on power actually distracts from conscious policies.

To be sure, the authors of the "smart power" report are not void of praise for European imperialism, particularly the 19th-century British imperialism that, they claim, contains precious lessons for the "smarter" America of the 21st century. Their point - about "legitimized British power in the eyes of others" - is clearly Eurocentric and blind to the perception of the colonized populations who eventually removed the chains one way or another. But that is a separate story.

Tightly packed into the report is the incontrovertible fact that American standing in the world has suffered. Yet, any report focused on "how America wields power in the world" that omits a serious consideration of the multiple causes, such as the American quagmire in Iraq, cannot possibly be taken seriously.

The trouble is, however, that both authors of the report are on record supporting the 2003 invasion, although in fairness to Nye, he did criticize it as the "right war at the wrong time", and targeted President George W Bush's failure to "neglect of allies and institutions" that have created a "a sense of illegitimacy". [3] The problem with Nye's approach, however, is the failure to recognize that the "pretextual" war against a sovereign nation in the Middle East, which bypassed the UN, could not possibly have the required legitimacy even if professor Nye and his arsenal of "soft power" pills were in order at the White House; in a word, contrary to Nye, it was the wrong war at the wrong time.

Formerly of the US State Department, Francis Fukuyama has agreed that procuring legitimacy has to do with "justice". In other words, an unjust war cannot be called legitimate no matter what the verbal acrobatics by the likes of Nye and others, who pay lip service to the "de-legitimating" US Middle East policies, ie, neglecting the Middle East peace process, mentioned only in passing in the above-said report, without due consideration of the serious ramification of such neglects with respects to the threats facing the US today.

While side-stepping the Iraq issue with the lame excuse of "broader" perspectives that need to "replace the narrow lens focused on Iraq", the report gives several other reasons for the waning influence of US, ie, reactions to American-led globalization, US's "angry" response to September 11, perception of incompetence, and the side-effects of Cold War success as a lone superpower. Here, the authors conflate the long-term causes of power decline with the negative fall outs of questionable policies, such as with respect to US unilateralism.

Regarding the latter, Robert Jervis has correctly pointed at the structural causes of American unilateralism, chiefly the absence of external restraints to American power. In comparison, Nye and Armitage mention other nations resorting to the UN to "constrain" the US power, yet provide no analysis of why the US has fallen astray from "norm-based internationalism", the fact that it has to do with power dynamism and America's "totalizing" power grab at the global level, to borrow a term from the French philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Pierre-Felix Guattari.

In light of their benign, tolerant attitude toward the exercise of American power, even under the Bush administration, which is said to have used "elements of smart power", Nye and Armitage never really get to the bottom of their own frank admission that today many nations "resent US's unbounded dominance".

Instead of drawing from this insight the necessity of a multi-polar world order, the report on "smart power" is keen on maintaining America's "preeminence" in the world and the various ways to ensure it, simultaneously throwing ideas such as "shared leadership" and "accommodating rising powers". True to its contradictory nature, the report on the one hand admits that global politics is not a "zero-sum game" and, yet, in the same breath sends the message that "China can only become preeminent if the US continues to allow its own power of attraction to atrophy".

Flawed, inadequate diagnosis of the problems behind America's waning influence go hand-in-hand with equally inadequate prescriptions for a new US foreign policy, no matter how useful the insights on increasing foreign aid, closing down Guantanamo detention center, focusing on public diplomacy, that is, the usual panoply of "neo-liberal" recipes for action, with the sole exception of omitting the word "interdependence" previously highlighted in Nye's own writings.

These **recommendations are not far-reaching enough**, often tackling the symptoms rather than the real causes of problems, overall denoting a mindset that reflects policy continuity (with the past and the present) when discontinuity should have the upper hands signaling a real foreign policy reorientation away from the disastrous policies of the Bush presidency.

Clearly, such a reorientation is impossible short of a paradigmatic shift away from the core assumptions of the American hegemonic model (which are only superficially questioned in this report). Devoid of such a radical shift, the report's "smart power" has nested in it the elements of a vicious policy circle, bound to reintroduce failed US policies under new guises.

**No impact to soft power—countries will still work with us**

**Kagan, 06** (Robert, senior fellow at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, The Washington Post, 1/15, http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=17894&prog=zgp&proj=zusr)

The striking thing about the present international situation is the degree to which America remains what Bill Clinton once called "the indispensable nation." Despite global opinion polls registering broad hostility to George W. Bush's United States, the behavior of governments and political leaders suggests America's position in the world is not all that different from what it was before Sept. 11 and the Iraq war. The much-anticipated global effort to balance against American hegemony -- which the realists have been anticipating for more than 15 years now -- has simply not occurred. On the contrary, in Europe the idea has all but vanished. European Union defense budgets continue their steady decline, and even the project of creating a common foreign and defense policy has slowed if not stalled. Both trends are primarily the result of internal European politics. But if they really feared American power, Europeans would be taking more urgent steps to strengthen the European Union's hand to check it. Nor are Europeans refusing to cooperate, even with an administration they allegedly despise. Western Europe will not be a strategic partner as it was during the Cold War, because Western Europeans no longer feel threatened and therefore do not seek American protection. Nevertheless, the current trend is toward closer cooperation. Germany's new government, while still dissenting from U.S. policy in Iraq, is working hard and ostentatiously to improve relations. It is bending over backward to show support for the mission in Afghanistan, most notably by continuing to supply a small but, in German terms, meaningful number of troops. It even trumpets its willingness to train Iraqi soldiers. Chancellor Angela Merkel promises to work closely with Washington on the question of the China arms embargo, indicating agreement with the American view that China is a potential strategic concern. For Eastern and Central Europe, the growing threat is Russia, not America*,* and the big question remains what it was in the 1990s: Who will be invited to join NATO?

### China

**Squo solves**

**Schwartz 03** – Adjunct Scholar, CEI (Joel, “Particulate Air Pollution: Weighing the Risks,” April, http://cei.org/pdf/3452.pdf)

America’s air quality has vastly improved in recent decades due to progressiveemission reductions from industrial facilities and motor vehicles.The country achievedthis success despite substantial increases in population, automobile travel, and energyproduction.Air pollution will continue to decline, both because more recent vehiclemodels start out cleaner and stay cleaner as they age than earlier ones, and also becausealready-adopted standards for new vehicles and existing power plants and industrialfacilities come into effect in the next few years.

**China will never attack the Russian Far East–it would be diplomatic and military suicide**

**MENON 2003** (Rajan, Monroe J. Rathbone Professor of International Relations at Lehigh University, The National Interest, Fall)

By contrast, China's military, which was quite recently a giant horde of foot soldiers, is modernizing steadily-chiefly with Russian weaponry, much of it supplied from cash-starved military industries in Khabarovsk, Komsomol'sk and Vladivostok. It may lag far behind the United States, but in force projection, speed, accuracy and lethality it is a wholly different force than it was a decade ago, thanks to Russian fighter jets, submarines, tanks and missiles, many of them built in the Russian Far East. Yet the chances that China will attempt to conquer Russia's Far East are slim. Such a brazen power play would damage China's wider interests. Taiwan might recoil in terror and treat Beijing's proposals for a negotiated reunification with even greater skepticism and wariness. The prevailing Western rationale for economic engagement with China-that commerce will transform and co-opt that country-would be shredded. China would likely face a counterbalancing, encircling coalition of the United States, India, Japan, Russia and Vietnam. Would such setbacks justify the burdens of ruling the vast, problem-infested Russian Far East? The Chinese leaders know their Sun Tzu: what they seek from the Russian Far East (access to resources and a benign northern front) can be had by means of silk-gloved hegemony. Chinese interests can be served without its formal occupation of the territory. Indeed, what may emerge could be a "reverse Manchurian" scenario, where the Russian Far East remains a titular part of Russia but is increasingly integrated into Beijing's sphere of influence. That is precisely what the conspiracy among geography, demography, power and time may create in Russia's Far East.

### No Modeling

**Using other countries’ constituencies to measure our favorability in lab is meaningless**

**Ajami 8**

(Fouad, Bradley Prize Recipient, School of Advanced Foreign International Studies at John Hopkins University, author of *The Foreigner’s Gift*, “Anti-Americanism is Mostly Hype,” June 23, Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB121417762529095457.html?mod=opinion\_main\_commentaries)

So America is unloved in Istanbul and Cairo and Karachi: It is an annual ritual, the June release of the Pew global attitudes survey and the laments over the erosion of America's standing in foreign lands.

We were once loved in Anatolia, but now a mere 12% of Turks have a "favorable view" of the U.S. Only 22% of Egyptians think well of us. Pakistan is crucial to the war on terror, but we can only count on the goodwill of 19% of Pakistanis.

American liberalism is heavily invested in this narrative of U.S. isolation. The Shiites have their annual ritual of 10 days of self-flagellation and penance, but this liberal narrative is ceaseless: The world once loved us, and all Parisians were Americans after 9/11, but thanks to President Bush we have squandered that sympathy.

It is an old trick, the use of foreign narrators and witnesses to speak of one's home. Montesquieu gave the genre its timeless rendition in his Persian Letters, published in 1721. No one was fooled, these were Parisian letters, and the Persian travelers, Rica and Usbek, mere stand-ins for an author taking stock of his homeland after the death of Louis XIV and the coming of an age of enlightenment and skepticism.

### Culture

#### Native American culture will survive due to a balance between traditionalists and modernists

**Weir 98**

(Robert F., Kellogg National fellow, Post-doctoral fellow in Clinical Medical ethics, Ph. D in Religious Studies, Professor of Pediatrics, “Stored Tissue Samples: Ethical, Legal, and Public Policy Implications,” University of Iowa Press, p. 271, http://books.google.com/books?id=5JDHqa4bf24C&pg=PA268&lpg=PA268&dq=indian+health+services+sovereignty&source=bl&ots=-suIuwNbZ4&sig=qg-\_eTZYCvnDOeIF55jSVPlroHg&hl=en&ei=vE5nSvLfCpHplAeU6sXdDA&sa=X&oi=book\_result&ct=result&resnum=10)

In a quite recent qualitative study about the Mesquaki Tribe in Iowa, a young traditionalist described how his/their culture has endured:

Our culture is a living thing. We don’t do the ceremonies exactly the way they were done a hundred or two hundred years ago. We may be doing some things different. Some people who don’t come to the ceremonies might say we do it wrong, but we do the best we can. We are trying to keep alive what the creator gave us. I was taught that the tribe always had conservatives and progressives. We have always had to decide how much of the whiteman’s ways we will use. Sometimes we don’t bend fast enough and we hurt ourselves. Other times maybe we give up our old ways too fast and that hurts us too. The ones who want us to be more modern drag us along. And the ones who are more traditional save what we have. And we are still here.

#### Without funding for language preservation, Native American culture loss is inevitable

**Lutz 7**

(Ellen L., executive director of Cultural Survival, former director of the Center for Human rights and Conflict Resulution, former professor of International criminal law at Tufts, former director of California’s Human Rights Watch, JD UC Berkeley, MA Anthropology Bryn Mawr, “Saving America’s Endangered Languages,” Rescuing Critically Endangered Native American Languages, Cultural Survival Quarterly 31.2 (Summer 2007), <http://www.culturalsurvival.org/ourpublications/csq/article/saving-americas-endangered-languages>)

Revitalizing critically endangered Native American languages is not on the list of urgent public policy priorities. Yet to the Native Americans whose languages are just a few years away from extinction, the loss goes to the heart of their identity. It’s a matter of cultural survival.

Native Americans did not lose their languages. Their languges were stolen from them by immigrants to American shores who believed in assimilation, the melting pot, and the great American dream. But Native Americans were not immigrants. They were conquered peoples who were pushed off their lands and marginalized. They clung to their languages and cultures to prevent the loss of their identities, but the government set up a system of boarding schools that punished Indians for speaking languages other than English, instilling in them the fear that if they taught their children their languages, their children would suffer. Even after the boarding schools were closed the fear remained. As a result, among the estimated 154 indigenous languages still remaining in the United States, half are spoken by only a handful of elders over 70 and are not being taught to children. Many tribes have the will to revitalize their languages, but urgently need a substantial influx of funding, training, and technical support to produce new fluent speakers.
Research shows that language revitalization is a key empowerment tool for Native American communities. Language learning confers cognitive advantages, enhances self-esteem and cultural well-being, and strengthens community bonds. As one indigenous language instructor put it, “Our language is the number-one source of our soul, our pride, our being, our strength, and our identity.”