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#### First, interpretation- restrictions on energy production are limited to direct legal prohibitions or limits on the ability to produce

#### Energy production is extraction and capture- it excludes the second stage of transformation and the third stage of use

Bhattacharyya 11

[Subhes.C., Senior Lecturer in Energy/ Petroleum Economics at Centre for Energy, Petroleum and Mineral Law and Policy, He specialises in energy economics, energy planning and policy issues, regulatory and restructuring of energy industries and energy environment interactions, Energy Economics, “Chapter 2: Energy Data and Energy Balance”, 2011 //wyo-tjc]

An energy balance table has three main building blocks: the supply-side information, conversion details and the demand information. The supply-side information captures domestic supply of energy products through production, international trade, and stock change. Energy production provides the marketable quantities of energy domestically produced in a country. Marketable quantities exclude any part of the production that is not available for use or stock. Examples include wastes (gas flaring), re-injection as part of production process (gas re-injection), removal of impurities, etc.

The external trade information captures the transactions of energies taking place across the national boundary of a country, irrespective of whether customs clearance was taken or not. Imports are those quantities that enter the country for domestic use (this excludes transits). Exports are those quantities leaving the country for use by outsiders. As imports expand domestic supply, it is considered as a positive flow in the energy accounts whereas exports are considered as a negative flow. Fuel used by ships for international voyages is considered as a special item and included as bunker. This is treated in a similar manner as international trade and any quantity delivered to ships, irrespective of their country of registration, undertaking international voyages is eligible for this treatment.

Stocks of fuels serve as cushions to cover fluctuations in supply and demand and are maintained by the suppliers, importers/exporters and the consumers. A stock rise represents a diminution in available supplies, and a stock fall represents an increase in supplies. For this reason, a minus sign is used to denote a rise and that a plus sign is used to denote a stock fall. The net position of domestic supply considering the above elements gives the primary energy supply of any energy.

The transformation section of the energy accounting captures the conversion of primary energies into secondary energies either through physical or chemical changes. Normally the inputs used in the transformation process are given a negative sign while the outputs are given a positive sign. If a single output comes from a number of energy sources, the clarity of input–output relation may be lost when the information is placed in a single row. In such cases, further details are presented as memo items or in additional rows. Commonly used transformation processes are oil refining, electricity generation, gas separation and conversion, coke production from coal, etc. However, as with supply information, transformation or conversion is also a country specific section of the energy account and would normally vary across countries.

#### Restrictions are policy instruments—either statutory or regulatory—that directly limit activity

Free Legal Dictionary, accessed 12

[http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/restriction //wyo-tjc]

restriction n. any limitation on activity, by statute, regulation or contract provision. In multi-unit real estate developments, condominium and cooperative housing projects, managed by homeowners' associations or similar organizations are usually required by state law to impose restrictions on use. Thus, the restrictions are part of the "covenants, conditions and restrictions," intended to enhance the use of common facilities and property, recorded and incorporated into the title of each owner.

#### ‘On’ refers to the indicated destination or focus of an effort

Merriam Webster, no date

[http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/on]

9a —used as a function word to indicate destination or the focus of some action, movement, or directed effort <crept up on him> <feast your eyes on this> <working on my skiing> <made a payment on the loan> b —used as a function word to indicate the focus of feelings, determination, or will <have pity on me> <keen on sports> <a curse on you> c —used as a function word to indicate the object with respect to some misfortune or disadvantageous event <the crops died on them> d —used as a function word to indicate the subject of study, discussion, or consideration <a book on insects> <reflect on that a moment> <agree on price> e : with respect to <go light on the salt> <short on cash>

#### Second, violation: The plan only removes a restriction that’s not specifically on the production of wind.

#### Third, Reasons to prefer:

#### A-Principled limit- restriction isn’t a term of art in energy literature and it is commonly used in context. Direct legal barriers is the only way to place a limit on what counts

#### B- Education- expansive definitions creates an opportunity cost with learning about the ins and outs of the barriers within the leasing system because a larger topic trades off with in depth case research and results in more generics

#### Fourth, vote negative: Topicality is a voting issue because it is a prima facie burden and should be evaluated as a question of competing interpretations

# 2

#### Obama is winning the election now, but it’s close

Montanaro 10-29

(Domenico Montanaro, writer for MSNBC. “Romney, Obama camps spar over who's really winning” 10-29-12 http://firstread.nbcnews.com/\_news/2012/10/29/14783817-romney-obama-camps-spar-over-whos-really-winning?lite//wyoccd)

The latest is over whether Republican challenger Mitt Romney is making up so much ground on President Barack Obama that he is expanding the map into places like Pennsylvania and even Minnesota – or whether Romney’s path is so limited that he needs to find new states to put in play. Recommended: Sandy gives unpredictable twist to 2012 election There is some evidence for the expansion and tightened battleground landscape. There is a new poll today, for example, from the University of Cincinnati showing Romney closing the gap in Ohio to a tied race, 49 to 49 percent. Some polls in the Keystone State in recent weeks have showed Romney within 5 points, but the Romney campaign has not made a serious play for the state, booking no ads despite those public polls. A poll out today from the Philadelphia Inquirer shows Obama up 49 to 43 percent. That’s a slight improvement for Romney from earlier this month, when Obama was up 50 to 42 percent. The pro-Romney outside group Restore Our Future, however, is now giving it another shot in Pennsylvania, booking $2 million in ads for this week. The Obama campaign says it will respond with ads of its own, because it’s not “going to take anything for granted right now,” Campaign Manager Jim Messina said on a conference call with reporters, but the campaign categorically denies that it is seeing any momentum for Romney in its data. "I don't want to be ambiguous about this at all: We're winning this race,” Obama campaign adviser David Axelrod said on the call, “and I say that not on the basis of some mystical faith in a wave that's going to come...We base it on cold, hard data. … In just eight days, we'll know who was bluffing and who wasn't." Two polls in Minnesota show two different stories – one from Mason-Dixon showing a 4-point race, 47 to 43 percent with Obama leading; the other from St. Cloud University has it Obama 53 percent, Romney 45 percent, close to the president’s 2008 margin. The Obama campaign began running advertising in Minneapolis last week, which it said is intended for Wisconsin, but it is also dispatching former President Bill Clinton to Minnesota for two campaign events tomorrow.

#### Obama winning the working class white vote now, but Romney is close enough for vote switching

National Post 10-31

(“White Working-Class Voters Expanding Presidential Battleground Map” 10-31-12 http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/against-the-grain/white-working-class-voters-expanding-presidential-battleground-map-20121031//wyoccd)

That’s creating a scenario where the president faces a high bar to expand the minority share of electorate even further over 2008 to compensate. Indeed, one of the reasons polling tends to be most volatile in these states is that the makeup of the electorate will determine the winner. There aren’t a whole lot of persuadable voters here. Polls showing Romney ahead assume the electorate will be whiter and older; polls showing Obama leading tend to expect a more diverse electorate. The winner in these states will be which campaign is best able to turn out its base. Early vote tallies in all three states suggest that Democrats are coming close to hitting their turnout targets, but with GOP enthusiasm surging substantially versus a weak showing in 2008. Meanwhile, the Obama turnout machine isn’t quite as valuable in the more homogeneous battleground states--Iowa, Ohio, Wisconsin, and New Hampshire--that make up the president’s firewall. These states have older, whiter electorates. The name of the game for Democrats here is persuasion as much as mobilization. In Ohio, Obama’s campaign strategy is clear: making Romney’s opposition to the auto bailout a central part of the bid to hold onto enough working-class whites to win the state. But it’s also becoming clear that it’s not just Ohio, Iowa, and Wisconsin that are looking winnable for Romney--it’s the entire swath of competitive Midwestern and Rust Belt states that share demographic similarities, and where Republicans made significant gains during the 2010 midterms. Obama holds a small lead in Ohio thanks to the auto bailout, but the issues driving the electorate in neighboring states are more favorable to Republicans.

#### Blue collar, working class whites will decide the election due to their swing state locations- Obama will alienate them and send them to Romney should he reject traditional FF expansion

Mead 2012

[Walter Russell Mead, James Clarke Chace Professor of Foreign Affairs and Humanities at Bard College and Editor-at-Large of The American Interest magazine, and is recognized as one of the country's leading students of American foreign policy. June 6, 2012, <http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2012/06/06/green-politics-hurting-obama-in-swing-states/>, Uwyo//amp]

Since the beginning of the recession, America’s “brown jobs” revolution has been one of the few bright spots in an otherwise shaky recovery. States like North Dakota and Texas have led the country in growth due to their strong energy sectors, and the discovery of vast quantities of shale gas in states like Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Colorado are now providing new jobs. These states have more than shale gas in common: all of them are also on the short list of swing states that decide this year’s presidential election. Republicans are seizing the opportunity to make energy politics a centerpiece of their campaign. As the FT reports: “Blue-collar voters were never that sold on environmental issues, and if some Democrats come across as not keen on economic development, it could lose them support here in Ohio,” he said. Republicans, from Mitt Romney, the party’s presidential candidate, to the congressional leadership, have made Barack Obama’s alleged stifling of the energy industry a centrepiece of their campaigns this year. . . . Mr Romney has said he will approve the Keystone XL pipeline as soon as he wins office and curb the powers of the Environmental Protection Agency. Only time will tell whether this is a winning strategy, but there is reason to think it could work. As we’ve mentioned before, energy politics is an area where Obama is particularly vulnerable. His decision to nix the popular Keystone pipeline earlier this year signaled antipathy toward one of America’s strongest industries while doing nothing to help the environment; it was lambasted as a pointless blunder by observers on both sides of the aisle. Meanwhile, his pet projects in alternative energy have fallen flat, as debacles like Solyndra have received far more attention than the program’s few successes. This should be seriously worrying to the Obama campaign. Brown jobs may be unpopular in Obama’s white-collar, urban, coastal base, but it is blue collar voters in swing states that are likely to decide the election, and many of these voters stand to reap significant benefits from an expansion of America’s energy sector. From a political perspective, Obama has placed himself on the wrong side of this issue. It may come back to bite him come November.

**Romney election causes Iran strikes. Approach to Iran is the biggest contrast in Obama and Romney foreign policy – Obama will continue to push sanctions and negotiation while Romney will bow to Israeli desires to attack and pursue a bombastic foreign policy.**

**Daily KOs**, Editorial, “The Daily Kos, President Obama Versus Romney on Iran”, 4/16/**2012** <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/04/16/1083726/-President-Obama-versus-Romney-on-Iran>

To me, however **the biggest contrast is their approach to Iran.** Binyamin Netanyahu by all accounts is a hawk who is pushing the United States to bomb Iran and has been doing so for a long time. He appears to see no need for negotiation. Granted, he has a right to protect his nation if he believes that its under threat. However, **we all know how flawed the “intelligence” was for the Iraq war. And its important to let negotiations play out as far as possible before rushing to war, which would have many unintended consequences for years to come.** (See the Iraq war). Here’s the big difference. Here’s Netanyahu’s recent response to the ongoing P5+1 talks: http://news.yahoo.com/... Netanyahu -- whose government has not ruled out a preemptive strike on Iranian nuclear facilities -- earlier said however that Tehran had simply bought itself some extra time to comply. "My initial impression is that Iran has been given a 'freebie'," Netanyahu said during talks with visiting US Senator Joe Lieberman, the premier's office reported. "It has got five weeks to continue enrichment without any limitation, any inhibition. I think Iran should take immediate steps to stop all enrichment, take out all enrichment material and dismantle the nuclear facility in Qom," he said. "I believe that the world's greatest practitioner of terrorism must not have the opportunity to develop atomic bombs," he said. Here’s President Obama’s response yesterday to Netanyahu (in a response to a journalist's question) at the press conference in Cartagena: But Obama refuted that statement, saying "**The notion that we've given something away or a freebie would indicate that Iran has gotten something." "In fact, they got the toughest sanctions that they're going to be facing coming up in a few months if they don't take advantage of those talks. I hope they do," Obama said. "The clock is ticking and I've been very clear to Iran and our negotiating partners that we're not going to have these talks just drag out in a stalling process**," Obama told reporters after an Americas summit in Colombia. "But so far at least we haven't given away anything -- other than the opportunity for us to negotiate," he said. **Obama in conjunction with world powers is negotiating with Iran, trying to prevent** a needless **war.** You can be sure that Mitt **Romney would bow to his buddy Netanyahu and attack Iran. He has previously said “We will not have an inch of difference between ourselves and Israel”.** As he also said in a debate, before making any decision regarding Israel, he will call his friend Bibi. **Bottom line, if** somehow **the American people elect Mitt Romney, expect more of the bombastic, Bush cowboy approach to foreign policy with a** more than likely **bombardment of Iran. If** the American people are not fooled by this charlatan and **they reelect Barack Obama, he will continue in his measured way to deal with the threats around the world, quietly, through the use of negotiation, and force if absolutely necessary, but only as a last resort, without bragging, and scaring the American people with needless terrorism alerts.**

#### That leads to a global nuclear holocaust which draws in Russia and China AND leads to the detonation of CBW’s

**Morgan 09**

[Dennis Ray Morgan, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies- South Korea, 10 July 2009, World on fire: two scenarios of the destruction of human civilization and possible extinction of the human race, Futures 41 (2009) 683–693, uwyo//amp]

**Given the present day predicament regarding Iran’s attempt to become a nuclear power, particular attention should be given to one of Moore’s scenarios depicting nuclear war that begins through an attack on Iran’s supposed nuclear facilities**. According to Seymour Hersh [12] **the nuclear option against Iran has, in fact, been discussed** by sources in the Pentagon as a viable option. As Hersh reports, **according to a former intelligence officer, the lack of ‘‘reliable intelligence leaves military planners, given the goal of totally destroying the sites, little choice but to consider the use of tactical nuclear weapons. ‘Every other option, in the view of the nuclear weaponeers, would leave a gap,’** the former senior intelligence official said. ‘Decisive is the key word of the Air Force’s planning. **It’s a tough decision. But we made it in Japan**.’’ [12].10 The official continues to explain **how White House and Pentagon officials are considering the nuclear option for Iran, ‘‘Nuclear planners go through extensive training** and learn the technical details of damage and fallout - we’re talking about mushroom clouds, radiation, mass casualties, and contamination over years. This is not an underground nuclear test, where all you see is the earth raised a little bit. **These politicians don’t have a clue, and whenever anybody tries to get it out – remove the nuclear option – they’re shouted down’’** [12]. Understandably, some members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were not comfortable about consideration of the nuclear option in a first strike, and some officers have even discussed resigning. Hersh quotes the former intelligence officer as saying, ‘‘Late this winter, the Joint Chiefs of Staff sought to remove the nuclear option from the evolving war plans for Iran - without success. The White House said, ‘Why are you challenging this? The option came from you’’’ [12]. **This scenario has gained even more plausibility since a January 2007 Sunday Times report [13] of an Israeli intelligence leak that Israel was considering a strike against Iran, using low-yield bunker busting nukes to destroy Iran’s supposedly secret underground nuclear facilities. In Moore’s scenario, non-nuclear neighboring countries would then respond with conventional rockets and chemical, biological and radiological weapons. Israel then would retaliate with nuclear strikes on several countries, including a pre-emptive strike against Pakistan, who then retaliates with an attack not only on Israel but pre-emptively striking India as well. Israel then initiates the ‘‘Samson option’’ with attacks on other Muslim countries, Russia, and possibly the ‘‘anti-Semitic’’ cities of Europe. At that point, all-out nuclear war ensues as the U.S. retaliates with nuclear attacks on Russia and possibly on China** as well.11 Out of the four interrelated factors that could precipitate a nuclear strike and subsequent escalation into nuclear war, probably the accidental factor is one that deserves particular attention since its likelihood is much greater than commonly perceived. In an article, ‘‘20 Mishaps that Might Have Started a Nuclear War,’’ Phillips [14] cites the historical record to illustrate how an accident, misinterpretation,or false alarm could ignite a nuclear war. Most of these incidents occurred during a time of intense tension between the U.S. and the Soviet Union in the Cuban Missile Crisis, but other mishaps occurred during other times, with the most recent one in 1995. Close inspection of each of these incidents reveals how likely it is that an ‘‘accident’’ or misinterpretation of phenomena or data (‘‘glitch’’) can lead to nuclear confrontation and war. In his overall analysis, Phillips writes: The probability of actual progression to nuclear war on any one of the occasions listed may have been small, due to planned ‘‘failsafe’’ features in the warning and launch systems, and to responsible action by those in the chain of command when the failsafe features had failed. However, the accumulation of small probabilities of disaster from a long sequence of risks adds up to serious danger. There is no way of telling what the actual level of risk was in these mishaps but if the chance of disaster in every one of the 20 incidents had been only 1 in 100, it is a mathematical fact that the chance of surviving all 20 would have been 82%, i.e. about the same as the chance of surviving a single pull of the trigger at Russian roulette played with a 6- shooter. With a similar series of mishaps on the Soviet side: another pull of the trigger. If the risk in some of the events had been as high as 1 in 10, then the chance of surviving just seven such events would have been less than 50:50. [14]12 **Aggression in the Middle East along with the willingness to use low-yield ‘‘bunker busting’’ nukes by the U.S. only increases the likelihood of nuclear war and catastrophe in the future. White House and Pentagon policy-makers are seriously considering the use of strategic nuclear weapons against Iran**. As Ryan McMaken explains, **someone at the Pentagon who had . . .not yet completed the transformation into a complete sociopath leaked the ‘Nuclear Posture Review’ which outlined plans for a nuclear ‘end game’ with Iraq, Iran, Libya, North Korea, and Syria, none of which possess nuclear weapons. The report also outlined plans to let the missiles fly on Russia and China** as well, even though virtually everyone on the face of the Earth thought we had actually normalized relations with them. **It turns out, much to the surprise of the Chinese and the Russians, that they are still potential enemies in a nuclear holocaust.**

# 3

### NEOLIBERAL POLITICAL RIGHTS ARE USED TO JUSTIFY THE EXPANSION OF FREE TRADE AND GLOBALIZATION

Tony **Evans**, “Citizenship and Human Rights in the Age of Globalization,” ALTERNATIVES: SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION & HUMANE GOVERNANCE v. 25 n. 4, October/December 20**00**, pp. 415-436.

Two broad arguments are used by neoliberals in support of human rights defined as civil and political rights, which I shall call, respectively, the altruistic arguments and the pragmatic arguments. Taken together, these arguments support the contention that neoliberals are concerned with promoting a particular set of human rights that places property rights at the top of any list of rights. The altruistic argument for promoting civil and political freedoms at the expense of economic and social rights is that encouraging free trade and ever greater levels of economic interconnectedness has a positive and beneficial effect on the human-rights record of countries that do not comply with internationally recognized human-rights standards. According to this argument, the social contacts generated by the unregulated exchange of goods and services is paralleled by an inevitable and unregulated exchange of moral values. If tyrannical governments want to enjoy the benefits of globalization and free trade, they cannot avoid the transmission of ideas that make people more aware of their rights. Free trade, therefore, has an important educative role: it has the potential to raise peoples awareness to their rights and increases the demand to be treated in accordance with internationally agreed standards of civil and political rights. In short, free trade has a "civilizing" influence on the "uncivilized" and should be actively promoted in the name of human rights.[5]

#### NEXT, THE DETERMINISM OF CAPITAL IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSTRUMENTALIZATION OF ALL LIFE—IT IS THIS LOGIC THAT MOBILIZES AND ALLOWS FOR THE 1AC’S SCENARIOS IN THE FIRST PLACE

DYER-WITHERFORD (professor of Library and Info. Sciences at the U of Western Ontario) 1999   
[Nick. Cyber Marx: Cycles and Circuits of Struggle in High Technology Capitalism.]

For capitalism, the use of machines as organs of “will over nature” is an imperative. The great insight of the Frankfurt School—an insight subsequently improved and amplified by feminists and ecologists—was that capital’s dual project of dominating both humanity and nature was intimately tied to the cultivation of “instrumental reason” that systematically objectifies, reduces, quantifies and fragments the world for the purposes of technological control. Business’s systemic need to cheapen labor, cut the costs of raw materials, and expand consumer markets gives it an inherent bias toward the piling-up of technological power. This priority—enshrined in phrases such as “progress,” “efficiency,” “productivity,” “modernization,” and “growth”—assumes an automatism that is used to override any objection or alternative, regardless of the environmental and social consequences. Today, we witness global vistas of toxification, deforestation, desertification, dying oceans, disappearing ozone layers, and disintegrating immune systems, all interacting in ways that perhaps threaten the very existence of humanity and are undeniably inflicting social collapse, disease, and immiseration across the planet. The degree to which this project of mastery has backfired is all too obvious.

#### OBSERVATION THREE: Put the ‘Fun’ Back in Fundamentals

#### Vote Negative to validate and adopt the method of structural/historical criticism that is the 1NC.

#### THIS IS NOT THE ALTERNATIVE, BUT IN TRUTH THE ONLY OPTION— METHOD IS THE FOREMOST POLITICAL QUESTION BECAUSE ONE MUST UNDERSTAND THE EXISTING SOCIAL TOTALITY BEFORE ONE CAN ACT ON IT—GROUNDING THE SITES OF POLITICAL CONTESTATION OR KNOWLEDGE OUTSIDE OF LABOR AND SURPLUS VALUE MERELY SERVE TO HUMANIZE CAPITAL AND PREVENT A TRANSITION TO A SOCIETY BEYOND OPPRESSION

TUMINO (Prof. English @ Pitt) 2001

[Stephen, “What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More than Ever”, Red Critique, p. online //wyo-tjc]

Any effective political theory will have to do at least two things: it will have to offer an integrated understanding of social practices and, based on such an interrelated knowledge, offer a guideline for praxis. My main argument here is that among all contesting social theories now, only Orthodox Marxism has been able to produce an integrated knowledge of the existing social totality and provide lines of praxis that will lead to building a society free from necessity. But first I must clarify what I mean by Orthodox Marxism. Like all other modes and forms of political theory, the very theoretical identity of Orthodox Marxism is itself contested—not just from non-and anti-Marxists who question the very "real" (by which they mean the "practical" as under free-market criteria) existence of any kind of Marxism now but, perhaps more tellingly, from within the Marxist tradition itself. I will, therefore, first say what I regard to be the distinguishing marks of Orthodox Marxism and then outline a short polemical map of contestation over Orthodox Marxism within the Marxist theories now. I will end by arguing for its effectivity in bringing about a new society based not on human rights but on freedom from necessity. I will argue that to know contemporary society—and to be able to act on such knowledge—one has to first of all know what makes the existing social totality. I will argue that the dominant social totality is based on inequality—not just inequality of power but inequality of economic access (which then determines access to health care, education, housing, diet, transportation, . . . ). This systematic inequality cannot be explained by gender, race, sexuality, disability, ethnicity, or nationality. These are all secondary contradictions and are all determined by the fundamental contradiction of capitalism which is inscribed in the relation of capital and labor. All modes of Marxism now explain social inequalities primarily on the basis of these secondary contradictions and in doing so—and this is my main argument—legitimate capitalism. Why? Because such arguments authorize capitalism without gender, race, discrimination and thus accept economic inequality as an integral part of human societies. They accept a sunny capitalism—a capitalism beyond capitalism. Such a society, based on cultural equality but economic inequality, has always been the not-so-hidden agenda of the bourgeois left—whether it has been called "new left," "postmarxism," or "radical democracy." This is, by the way, the main reason for its popularity in the culture industry—from the academy (Jameson, Harvey, Haraway, Butler,. . . ) to daily politics (Michael Harrington, Ralph Nader, Jesse Jackson,. . . ) to. . . . For all, capitalism is here to stay and the best that can be done is to make its cruelties more tolerable, more humane. This humanization (not eradication) of capitalism is the sole goal of ALL contemporary lefts (marxism, feminism, anti-racism, queeries, . . . ). Such an understanding of social inequality is based on the fundamental understanding that the source of wealth is human knowledge and not human labor. That is, wealth is produced by the human mind and is thus free from the actual objective conditions that shape the historical relations of labor and capital. Only Orthodox Marxism recognizes the historicity of labor and its primacy as the source of all human wealth. In this paper I argue that any emancipatory theory has to be founded on recognition of the priority of Marx's labor theory of value and not repeat the technological determinism of corporate theory ("knowledge work") that masquerades as social theory.

### Case

### 1

#### US-China magnesium dispute causes protectionism

China Daily 9/13  
"US to keep anti-dumping duty on China pure magnesium" ~<http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/business/2012-09/13/content_15754975.htm~~>   
WASHINGTON -- The US government determined on Thursday it would maintain the existing[anti-dumping](http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/bizchina/2006-10/09/content_704098.htm) duty on silicomanganese from China and Ukraine, despite [Beijing](http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/bizchina/local_beijing.html)'s repeatedcalls for Washington to drop protectionism.¶ The US International Trade Commission, ITC, said in a ruling that revoking the currentanti-[dumping](http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/bizchina/2006-10/09/content_704098.htm) duty orders on silicomanganese from China and Ukraine would be likely to leadto continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time. But thetrade panel terminated the existing anti-dumping duty order on imports from Brazil.¶ With regard to imports of this product from China, it has been the fourth five-year (sunset)review since June 10, 1991 when the duty was first introduced. As a result of ITC's affirmativedetermination, the existing orders will remain in force. The duty margin runs at 139.49 percent.Silicomanganese, a ferroalloy with high contents of manganese and silicon, is typically used inthe manufacture of stainless steel.¶ The US move came under the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. It requires the US Departmentof Commerce to revoke an anti-dumping or countervailing duty order, or terminate asuspension agreement, after five years unless the department and the ITC determine thatrevoking the order or terminating the suspension agreement would be likely to lead tocontinuation or recurrence of dumping or subsidies and of material injury within a reasonablyforeseeable time.¶ Trade tensions due to US protectionism against China have been simmering throughout theentire election year as both presidential candidates use China as a punching bag.¶ The Chinese [Ministry of Commerce](http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/bizchina/2006-11/16/content_734839.htm) has repeatedly urged the United States to abide by itscommitment against protectionism and work together with China and other members of theinternational community to maintain a free, open and just international trade environment.

#### Trade doesn’t solve war

Martin et. al. 8(Phillipe, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, and Centre for Economic Policy Research; Thierry MAYER, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, CEPII, and Centre for Economic Policy Research, Mathias THOENIG, University of Geneva and Paris School of Economics, The Review of Economic Studies 75)

Does globalization pacify international relations? The “liberal” view in political science argues that increasing trade flows and the spread of free markets and democracy should limit the incentive to use military force in interstate relations. This vision, which can partly be traced back to Kant’s Essay on Perpetual Peace (1795), has been very influential: The main objective of the European trade integration process was to prevent the killing and destruction of the two World Wars from ever happening again.1 Figure 1 suggests2 however, that during the 1870–2001 period, the correlation between trade openness and military conflicts is not a clear cut one. The first era of globalization, at the end of the 19th century, was a period of rising trade openness and multiple military conflicts, culminating with World War I. Then, the interwar period was characterized by a simultaneous collapse of world trade and conflicts. After World War II, world trade increased rapidly, while the number of conflicts decreased (although the risk of a global conflict was obviously high). There is no clear evidence that the 1990s, during which trade flows increased dramatically, was a period of lower prevalence of military conflicts, even taking into account the increase in the number of sovereign states.

# 2NC

#### Extend Morgan 2009 – US and Israeli strikes are likely to use nuclear bunker busters because of unreliable intelligence causing global nuclear holocaust.

#### The impact is extinction – 3 scenarios [1.] Causes US-China-Russia nuclear war.

#### [2.] Middle East CBW conflict – causes extinction

Ochs 2

Richard, June 9, pg. <http://www.freefromterror.net/other_articles/abolish.html>.

Of all the weapons of mass destruction, the genetically engineered biological weapons, many without a known cure or vaccine, are an extreme danger to the continued survival of life on earth. Any perceived military value or deterrence pales in comparison to the great risk these weapons pose just sitting in vials in laboratories. While a "nuclear winter," resulting from a massive exchange of nuclear weapons, could also kill off most of life on earth and severely compromise the health of future generations, they are easier to control. Biological weapons, on the other hand, can get out of control very easily, as the recent anthrax attacks has demonstrated. There is no way to guarantee the security of these doomsday weapons because very tiny amounts can be stolen or accidentally released and then grow or be grown to horrendous proportions. The Black Death of the Middle Ages would be small in comparison to the potential damage bioweapons could cause. Abolition of chemical weapons is less of a priority because, while they can also kill millions of people outright, their persistence in the environment would be less than nuclear or biological agents or more localized. Hence, chemical weapons would have a lesser effect on future generations of innocent people and the natural environment. Like the Holocaust, once a localized chemical extermination is over, it is over. With nuclear and biological weapons, the killing will probably never end. Radioactive elements last tens of thousands of years and will keep causing cancers virtually forever. Potentially worse than that, bio-engineered agents by the hundreds with no known cure could wreck even greater calamity on the human race than could persistent radiation. AIDS and ebola viruses are just a small example of recently emerging plagues with no known cure or vaccine. Can we imagine hundreds of such plagues? HUMAN EXTINCTION IS NOW POSSIBLE.

#### [3.] Causes India-Pakistan conflict – that causes extinction

Fai 7/8/01 (Ghulam Nabi; Executive director - Kashmiri American Council) Washington Times l/n wbw

The foreign policy of the United States in South Asia should move from the lackadaisical and distant (with India crowned with a unilateral veto power) to aggressive involvement at the vortex. **The most dangerous place on the planet is** Kashmir, a disputed territory convulsed and illegally occupied for more than 53 years and **sandwiched between nuclear -capable India and Pakistan**. **It has ignited two wars** between the estranged South Asian rivals in 1948 and 1965, **and a third could trigger nuclear volleys and a nuclear winter threatening the entire globe**. The United States would enjoy no sanctuary. This apocalyptic vision is no idiosyncratic view. **The director of central intelligence, the Defense Department, and world experts generally place Kashmir at the peak of their nuclear worries**. **Both India and Pakistan are racing like thoroughbreds to bolster their nuclear arsenals and advanced delivery vehicles**. **Their defense budgets are climbing despite widespread misery amongst their populations**. Neither country has initialed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, or indicated an inclination to ratify an impending Fissile Material/Cut-off Convention.

#### US strike on Iran causes extinction

Hirsch 6

Jorge, Professor of Physics at the University of California San Diego, 2006“America and Iran: At the Brink of the Abyss”, Feb 20, <http://www.antiwar.com/orig/hirsch.php?articleid=8577>.

The U.S. has just declared that it will defend Israel militarily against Iran if needed. Presumably this includes a scenario where Israel would initiate hostilities by unprovoked bombing of Iranian facilities, as it did with Iraq's Osirak, and Iran would respond with missiles targeting Israel. The U.S. intervention is likely to be further bombing of Iran's facilities, including underground installations that can only be destroyed with low-yield nuclear bunker-busters. Such nuclear weapons may cause low casualties, perhaps only in the hundreds [.pdf], but the nuclear threshold will have been crossed. Iran's reaction to a U.S. attack with nuclear weapons, no matter how small, cannot be predicted with certainty. U.S. planners may hope that it will deter Iran from responding, thus saving lives. However, just as the U.S. forces in Iraq were not greeted with flowers, it is likely that such an attack would provoke a violent reaction from Iran and lead to the severe escalation of hostilities, which in turn would lead to the use of larger nuclear weapons by the U.S. and potential casualties in the hundreds of thousands. Witness the current uproar over cartoons and try to imagine the resulting upheaval in the Muslim world after the U.S. nukes Iran. - The Military's Moral Dilemma - Men and women in the military forces, including civilian employees, may be facing a difficult moral choice at this very moment and in the coming weeks, akin to the moral choices faced by Colin Powell and Dan Ellsberg. The paths these two men followed were radically different. Colin Powell was an American hero, widely respected and admired at the time he was appointed secretary of state in 2001. In February 2003, he chose to follow orders despite his own serious misgivings, and delivered the pivotal UN address that paved the way for the U.S. invasion of Iraq the following month. Today, most Americans believe the Iraq invasion was wrong, and Colin Powell is disgraced, his future destroyed, and his great past achievements forgotten. Daniel Ellsberg, a military analyst, played a significant role in ending the Vietnam War by leaking the Pentagon Papers. He knew that he would face prosecution for breaking the law, but was convinced it was the correct moral choice. His courageous and principled action earned him respect and gratitude. The Navy has just reminded [.pdf] its members and civilian employees what the consequences are of violating provisions concerning the release of information about the nuclear capabilities of U.S. forces. Why right now, for the first time in 12 years? Because it is well aware of moral choices that its members may face, and it hopes to deter certain actions. But courageous men and women are not easily deterred. To disobey orders and laws and to leak information are difficult actions that entail risks. Still, many principled individuals have done it in the past and will continue to do it in the future ( see [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9].) Conscientious objection to the threat and use of nuclear weapons is a moral choice. Once the American public becomes fully aware that military action against Iran will include the planned use of nuclear weapons, public support for military action will quickly disappear. Anything could get the ball rolling. A great catastrophe will have been averted. Even U.S. military law recognizes that there is no requirement to obey orders that are unlawful. The use of nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear country can be argued to be in violation of international law, the principle of just war, the principle of proportionality, common standards of morality ([1], [2], [3], [4], [5]), and customs that make up the law of armed conflict. Even if the nuclear weapons used are small, because they are likely to cause escalation of the conflict they violate the principle of proportionality and will cause unnecessary suffering. The Nuremberg Tribunal, which the United States helped to create, established that "The fact that a person acted pursuant to order of his government or of a superior does not relieve him from responsibility under international law, provided a moral choice was in fact possible to him." To follow orders or to disobey orders, to keep information secret or to leak it, are choices for each individual to make – extremely difficult choices that have consequences. But not choosing is not an option. - America's Collective Responsibility - Blaming the administration or the military for crossing the nuclear threshold is easy, but responsibility will be shared by all Americans. All Americans knew, or should have known, that using nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear country like Iran was a possibility given the Bush administration's new policies. All Americans could have voiced their opposition to these policies and demand that they be reversed. The media will carry a heavy burden of responsibility. The mainstream media could have effectively raised public awareness of the possibility that the U.S. would use nuclear weapons against Iran. So far, they have chosen to almost completely hide the issue, which is being increasingly addressed in non-mainstream media. Members of Congress could have raised the question forcefully, calling for public hearings, demanding public discussion of the administration's plans, and passing new laws or resolutions. So far they have failed to do so and are derelict in their responsibility to their constituents. Letters to the president from some in Congress [1], [2] are a start, but are not likely to elicit a meaningful response or a change in plans and are a far cry from forceful action. Scientific organizations and organizations dealing with arms control and nuclear weapons could have warned of the dangers associated with the Iran situation. So far, they have not done so ([1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8]). Scientists and engineers responsible for the development of nuclear weapons could have voiced concern [.pdf] when the new U.S. nuclear weapons policies became known, policies that directly involve the fruits of their labor. Their voices have not been heard. Those who contribute their labor to the scientific and technical infrastructure that makes nuclear weapons and their means of delivery possible bear a particularly heavy burden of moral responsibility. Their voices have barely been heard. - The Nuclear Abyss - The United States is preparing to enter a new era: an era in which it will enforce nuclear nonproliferation by the threat and use of nuclear weapons. The use of tactical nuclear weapons against Iran will usher in a new world order. The ultimate goal is that no nation other than the U.S. should have a nuclear weapons arsenal. A telltale sign that this is the plan is the recent change in the stated mission of Los Alamos National Laboratory, where nuclear weapons are developed. The mission of LANL used to be described officially as "Los Alamos National Laboratory's central mission is to reduce the global nuclear danger" [1] [.pdf], [2] [.pdf], [3] [.pdf]. That will sound ridiculous once the U.S. starts throwing mini-nukes around. In anticipation of it, the Los Alamos mission statement has been recently changed to "prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction and to protect our homeland from terrorist attack." That is the present and future role of the U.S. nuclear arsenal, to be achieved through threat (deterrence) and use of nuclear weapons. References to the old mission are nowhere to be found in the current Los Alamos documents, indicating that the change was deliberate and thorough. It is not impossible that the U.S. will succeed in its goal. But it is utterly improbable. This is a big world. Once the U.S. crosses the nuclear threshold against a non-nuclear country, many more countries will strive to acquire nuclear weapons, and many will succeed. The nuclear abyss may turn out to be a steep precipice or a gentle slope. Either way, it will be a one-way downhill slide toward a bottomless pit. We will have entered a path of no return, leading in a few months or a few decades to global nuclear war and unimaginable destruction. But there are still choices to be made. Up to the moment the first U.S. nuclear bomb explodes, the fall into the abyss can be averted by choices made by each and every one of us. We may never know which choices prevented it if it doesn't happen. But if we make the wrong choices, we will know what they were. And so will future generations, even in a world where wars are fought with sticks and stones.

#### War with Iran cements fears of pre-emptions – forces Russia and China conflict

AP 2012

[Associated Press, January 23, 2012, EU adopts Iran oil embargo; China, Russia worried over US war threats, <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/europe/EU-adopts-Iran-oil-embargo-China-Russia-worried-over-US-war-threats/articleshow/11602863.cms>, uwyo//amp]

A leading state-run Chinese daily warned on Monday that Moscow and Beijing were seriously concerned over US attempts to go to war with Iran, IANS reported from Beijing. After Iraq and Afghanistan, the US "is preparing for a potential confrontation with Iran, and appears confident of another successful air strike. "Such a demonstration of armed might makes powers like Russia and China increasingly nervous," the commentary in the English language Global Times said. It said that "mainstream forces in Washington are trying to sell a ludicrous standpoint to the American people: that it is worthwhile to bear financial costs and even lose some lives to confront lurking dangers to US security in the Middle East. "This is not a rational analysis, but rather a pious belief in US politics. With an appetite for national security causes, the US becomes increasingly meticulous in eliminating potential challenges." The daily, which reflects the thinking in Chinese leadership, warned that by stirring up other powers' sense of insecurity, the US was actually undermining its own interests. "If the West slides into a war with Iran, the damages will not be any lower than the potential threat of Iran's nuclear power. "Perhaps the US is used to resorting to war to solve geopolitical problems," it said. "Many worry that such a mentality will sooner or later lead to a US clash with Russia and China." For Beijing and Moscow alike, it said, relations with the US had been stressful. In both countries, an increasing number of people now advocate a Moscow-Beijing alliance, Global Times said. "The two do have countermeasures against the US, and they are capable of deterring US allies," it added. "If they are really determined to join hands, the balance of power on many world issues will begin to shift."

#### Obama ahead now, several polls suggest winning key swing states

Sobel 10-28

(Robert Sobel, staff writer for the Examiner. “New polls: Obama now holding leads in Florida, Ohio, Virginia and Wisconsin” 10-28-12 http://www.examiner.com/article/new-polls-obama-now-holding-leads-florida-ohio-virginia-and-wisconsin-1//wyoccd)

With the election right around the corner, new polls released show President Obama starting to inch ahead of his Republican challenger, Mitt Romney. As a disappointing October comes to an end, President Obama hopes that new momentum can carry him to a second term. New polls released this weekend show President Obama holding a slight national lead, and holding or regaining leads in key swing states. The new Reuters/Ipsos poll released Sunday shows the president with a narrow national advantage, leading the former CEO of Bain Capital by two points, 47 to 45 percent. A new Minneapolis Star-Tribune poll has Mitt Romney trailing President Obama by three points in Minnesota, down 47 to 44 percent, with ten electoral votes on the line. Public Policy Polling released two new polls from Florida and New Hampshire, each showing President Obama with a small, but important lead. With the Sunshine State of Florida seeming like a lock for Mitt Romney, the new PPP poll now puts President Obama in the lead by one point. The lead is nothing to celebrate, but considering Romney had a lead as much as seven points in Florida over the last two weeks, the president and his campaign have to be happy at the swing in momentum. In New Hampshire, the PPP has President Obama up by two points over Mitt Romney, a three-point reversal from the previous week when Romney held a one point advantage. According to a new Washington Post poll, President Obama is leading Mitt Romney by four points in Virginia eclipsing the important 50 percent threshold, holding on to a 51 to 47 percent advantage. The PPP poll has President Obama matching his exact Virginia numbers in Ohio, leading Mitt Romney 51 to 47 percent. The election is coming down to the wire, and as both candidates continue to push their message, it's almost as important where the message gets delivered as it is what the message is. Mitt Romney saw his best stretch of the election following the first presidential debate, but after two bounce back performances by the president, Romney's "debate bounce" has stalled and the race is back to reality.Nate Silver of the New York Times and the 538 blog give President Obama a 74.6 percent chance of winning the election, carrying 296.6 electoral votes compared to 241.4 for Mitt Romney. While all eyes are on presidential polls, there's only number that really matters - 270 electoral votes and who gets there first.

#### Obama will win: can lose popular vote and still win Electoral College

Nazworth 10-29

(Napp Nazworth, writer for CSM.“Obama May Win Election Without Winning Popular Vote, Polls Suggest” 10-29-12

http://www.christianpost.com/news/obama-may-win-election-without-winning-popular-vote-polls-suggest-84070/#KlW7QmBwxFCPZzuU.99 //wyoccd)

Based upon recent polls, the possibility of President Barack Obama winning reelection without winning a plurality of votes appears more likely than usual. As of Sunday evening, the current Real Clear Politics average of national polls shows Obama's challenger, Republican candidate Mitt Romney, ahead by 0.9 percentage points (47.7 to 46.8). The Real Clear Politics "no toss ups" map, which shows the electoral college vote based upon the averages of recent polls, shows Obama winning with 290 electors to Romney's 248 electors; 270 electors are needed to win the presidency. Four presidents have won an election without winning a plurality of the popular vote: John Quincy Adams (1824), Rutherford B. Hayes (1876), Benjamin Harrison (1888), and George W. Bush (2000). "That's not a bad record, 52 out of 56. So I wouldn't worry about it so much. If one wins the electoral vote and loses the popular vote," conservative Washington Post columnist George Will said Sunday on ABC's "This Week." Others worry, though, that a split decision would have dire consequences. "I think 2000 was a moment of great crisis in this country and I think a lot of the polarization in this country, with that [split decision in the presidential race], with 9/11, it's what's caused this country to be, what I would call, a cold civil war, and would become even worse," said Andrew Sullivan, a conservative Obama supporter, on the same show. Speaking earlier in the broadcast, Newt Gingrich, a former speaker of the House who also has a Ph.D. in history, said he does not believe a split decision is likely, but Republicans would not challenge it if it happened. "We're a nation of law, we're going to obey the law," Gingrich said. "I think it's very unlikely, as a historian, that ... [Romney] could win a significant popular victory vote and not carry the electoral college." During the Constitutional Convention, the authors of the Constitution decided against having a popular vote for president and having Congress choose the president. The Electoral College was designed as a hybrid system between those alternatives: voters would choose electors, equal to the number of senators and representatives for each state, who would then vote for the president. In an October 2011 interview with The Christian Post, George C. Edwards, distinguished professor of political science at Texas A&M University in College Station, Texas, argued that the electoral college should be abolished and replaced with a popular vote. "It's a violation of the most fundamental principles of democracy, meaning equality in voting. Under the Electoral College, every citizen vote does not count the same. As a result, the candidate who gets fewer votes can win the election. I can't see how that's a good idea under democracy," Edwards said.

#### Obama will win the election: Romney is winning the popular vote, but Obama leads swing states

Picht 10-29

(Jim Picht, writer for the Washington Post. “Win or lose, Obama faces electoral disaster” 10-29-12 http://communities.washingtontimes.com/neighborhood/stimulus/2012/oct/28/win-or-lose-obama-faces-electoral-disaster//wyoccd)

WASHINGTON, October 29, 2012 — The United States has held 56 presidential elections. In four of them the loser had more popular votes than the winner, but lost in the electoral college. Only once, in 1876, did the losing candidate (Samuel J. Tilden, a Democrat) receive an absolute majority of popular vote and still lose the election (to Republican Rutherford B. Hayes). That could happen again this year. Republican Mitt Romney currently holds a lead over President Obama according to several polls, that lead taking him to just over half of all voters in Gallup and Rasmussen polls. Romney leads Obama in several other polls, though with a plurality rather than a majority of the vote. The odds are good that Romney will win the popular vote. The electoral math is less clear. Romney holds a significant lead in states totaling 191 electoral votes (his smallest lead being 5 percent in Arizona), while Obama holds a significant lead in states totaling 201 electoral votes (his smallest lead being five percent in Minnesota). In states with 146 total electoral votes, the candidates are within five points of each other, for the most part statistically tied within the margin of error of the polls. The bulk (104) of Obama’s electoral votes right now come from three states: California, Illinois and New York. Three of the four largest toss-up states lean to him: Michigan, Ohio and Pennsylvania. Aside from Florida, the toss-up states leaning to Romney are relatively small. If Romney doesn’t peel away two of the biggest three states leaning to Obama, it’s almost impossible for him to win the election. This is true even if his support deepens across the board. A 2 percent shift in Romney’s direction across the country would leave him with an absolute majority of the popular vote, but still without the electoral votes to win. The shift has to come in those big-three toss-up states. Hence even though Romney leads nationwide in most polls, the odds are still better than even that Obama will win the election.

### 2NC – AT: Obama = Strikes

#### [\_\_] Extend the Daily KOs 2012 evidence – the biggest foreign policy difference between Obama and Romney is their approach to Iran.

#### Obama presidency is preventing Israeli strike now – using other carrots to reduce pressure for war

Patrick Seale, commentator and author of several books on Middle East affairs, “Uzi Arad – Israel’s Super-Hawk”, GulfNews, 9/14/2012

US President Barack Obama has so far resisted Israel’s relentless pressure for war and its constant threat ‑ in effect blackmail ‑ that ‘If you won’t attack Iran, we will, and you will be forced to join in, whether you like it or not.’ To counter the accusation that he is ready to ‘throw Israel under a bus,’ Obama has showered the Jewish state with funds, with secret intelligence, with UN vetoes in its favour and with weapons, including the latest warplanes and bunker-busting bombs. He has joined with Israel in acts of state terrorism, such as cyber warfare against Iran. But all this is still not enough for Israel’s super-hawk. He wants Iran’s nuclear industry destroyed.

#### -Obama will continue to use negotiations and sanctions to pressure Iran without resorting to military action or kowtowing to Israeli pressure.

#### – campaign rhetoric forces his hand

Collinson 2012

[Stephen Collinson, journalist, AFP, January 11, 2011, Republicans attack Iran, seek to wound Obama, http://news.yahoo.com/republicans-attack-iran-seek-wound-obama-025751227.html, uwyo//amp]

Talking tough on Iran, Republican White House hopefuls are trying to puncture President Barack Obama's national security armor in the cauldron of the 2012 election campaign. They disdain Obama as weak towards Tehran, demand regime change and propose military attacks on Iran's subterranean nuclear program. Ironically, the Republican assault comes as Obama aides and some independent analysts argue that US and allied pressure is actually working, as new sanctions take an unprecedented toll on the Iranian economy. But Republicans fault Obama for his vow to engage US enemies, expressed in his own White House campaign in 2008, and say the administration has balked at imposing the "crippling" sanctions it promised. Republican frontrunner Mitt Romney's rhetoric has been so stark that some critics worry he risks backing himself into a corner if elected president. "If we reelect Barack Obama, Iran will have a nuclear weapon. If you elect Mitt Romney ... they will not have a nuclear weapon," he said in November.

#### – he will present military action as the only option

Dilek 11

(Emine, “All Republican Candidates Favor War with Iran”, 9-20, http://www.addictinginfo.org/2011/09/20/all-republican-candidates-favor-war-with-iran/, DOA: 11-12-11,)

All Republican Candidates Favor War with Iran Prepare yourself my fellow Americans. If you elect a Republican President in the 2012 elections, more than likely we will be at war with Iran before his or her Presidency is over. In a disturbing new article written by Trita Parsi, a columnist for Salon.com, he expertly connects the dots on which single foreign policy issue is uniting all GOP candidates: Iran. He writes that when it comes to Arab Spring and all other foreign policy issues, GOP candidates are all over the place. But when it is about Iran, they all agree; USA must be tougher. Parsi asserts that “Republicans will present a narrative that diplomacy was tried and failed, sanctions are tough but insufficient, and the only remaining option is some form of military action. As the memory of the Iraq invasion slowly fades away, Republican strategists calculate, the American public will return to rewarding toughness over wisdom at the ballot boxes.”

#### Obama pushing sanctions, negotiations, and diplomacy

Karon 2012

[Tony Karon, senior editor at TIME, January 23, 2012, Amid New Sanctions, Obama Confronts the Challenges of Diplomacy With Iran, http://globalspin.blogs.time.com/2012/01/23/can-obama-and-iran-talk-their-way-out-of-war/#ixzz1kJ7xrO00, uwyo//amp]

Despite the deafening racket of the mass-media drums of war, neither President Obama or the Pentagon have an appetite for a confrontation with Iran that could unleash havoc across the Middle East, and would at best simply delay Tehran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons. Yet, although U.S. intelligence believes that Iran has not yet taken a decision to build weapons, it has also shown no inclination to halt its nuclear development despite facing an unprecedented array of sanctions. In an election year in which Obama’s opponents paint him as weak in the face of an Iranian menace they routinely exaggerate, and in the face of a continued Israeli threat to unilaterally initiate hostilities, the President finds his options narrowing. Monday’s formal adoption by the European Union of an embargo on Iranian oil tightens the screws of what Tehran views as a campaign of economic warfare by Western powers. At the same time, however, the Administration appears to be once again turning its attention to the vexed question of finding a diplomatic solution to the standoff. Negotiations are clearly on the minds of both sides. “Consensus can only be reached through serious negotiations based on a cooperative approach and not via the wrong path of sanctions,” said Iranian foreign ministry spokesman Ramin Mehmanparast on Saturday. And President Obama, in his interview with TIME’s Fareed Zakaria last week, stressed that sanctions are designed to urge Iran to take “a diplomatic path where they forego nuclear weapons, abide by international rules and can have peacefulnuclear power as other countries do, subject to the restrictions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.”

#### Obama won’t strike Iran – empirics and the failure of political pressures prove

Gause, Professor of Political Science at the University of Vermont and Lustick, Bess W. Heyman Professor of Political Science at the University of Pennsylvania, 12

(F. Gregory the III, Ian S., Summer 2012, Middle East Policy Council, American and the Regional Powers in a Transforming Middle East, <http://www.mepc.org/journal/middle-east-policy-archives/america-and-regional-powers-transforming-middle-east>, accessed 7-4-2012, JKE

The problem posed for Washington in Iran currently is a striking example of how history, not repeating itself, nevertheless often rhymes. U.S. decision makers are confronting an intense campaign of public and private pressure, originating in Israel and from many of Israel's supporters in the United States, reinforced by some of America's Gulf allies, to "do something" about Iran. That "something" differs, among the advocates, from regime change to carrying out, participating in, or at least authorizing an attack on Iranian nuclear facilities. Once again, the specter of a totalitarian threat to the civilized world is portrayed as rising in Tehran — Red Communism in 1953, tyrannical Islamist fundamentalism in 2012. Debates rage, simulations are performed and wagers are made on insider.com. Will the United States and/or Israel attack Iran this year? The very fact that this is an issue of explicit and regular discussion is a major success for the Netanyahu government. It is a substantial justification for wondering if, indeed, the United States is more capable of implementing policies tailored to its interests now than it was during the Cold War or in Iraq during the George W. Bush administrations. We think it is. Despite this being an election year, when the leverage of Israeli governments over U.S. foreign policy is greatest, the United States will not attack Iran. The Obama administration is proving to be less susceptible to manipulation by its local allies than past administrations were, recognizing that its broader interests in a changing Middle East cannot be secured by military adventures. If such an attack does occur, it will be carried out by Israel against an American red light, not encouraged by an American green or yellow light. The administration's quiet but determined diplomacy has restrained Israel, while simultaneously implementing what is perhaps the most sophisticated and effective array of economic sanctions ever imposed on a country as large and important as Iran. It has organized a broad international front against Iranian proliferation and increased the pressure on Tehran at every level. It might not succeed, in the end, in preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear-weapons capability. But its approach has a much greater chance of success in preventing a nuclearized military confrontation in the region than a military strike that would unite Iranians (at least temporarily) behind their government, end domestic differences over nuclear strategy and, at best, set back its program a few years. In a broader context, the Iran case signifies that the United States is finding it easier to adapt to the disappearance of the old order in the Middle East than are local allies whose fundamental political logics are contradicted by twenty-first-century winds of change. Under this president, the United States is neither paralyzed against action out of fear of error, nor misled into a simplistic and dangerously uniform "doctrine." For evidence of the agility of American policy in the Middle East under the Obama administration, consider the degree to which policies in Iraq, Libya, Egypt and Syria have been specifically tailored to the challenges, opportunities and constraints those very different settings present, much as the administration's approach to the Iranian nuclear issue has been.

#### [\_\_] Romney ensures strikes:

#### -Romney would do the opposite – his close friendship with Netanyahu and cowboy approach to foreign policy will result in a strike on Iran.

### 2NC Strikes Bad – Dollar Dump

#### Strike means russia and china will dump the dollar

Heather Wokusch, “WWIII OR Bust: Implications of a US Attack on Iran,” February 20, 2006, www.dissidentvoice.org/Feb06/Wokusch20.htm

Attacking Iran could also tip the scales towards a new geopolitical balance, one in which the US finds itself shut out by Russia, [and] China, Iran, Muslim countries and the many others Bush has managed to piss off during his period in office. Just last month, Russia snubbed Washington by announcing it would go ahead and honor a $700 million contract to arm Iran with surface-to-air missiles, slated to guard Iran's nuclear facilities. And after being burned when the US-led Coalition Provisional Authority invalidated Hussein-era oil deals, China has snapped up strategic energy contracts across the world, including in Latin America, Canada and Iran. It can be assumed that China will not sit idly by and watch Tehran fall to the Americans. Russia and China have developed strong ties recently, both with each other and with Iran. Each possesses nuclear weapons, and arguably more threatening to the US, each holds large reserves of US dollars which can be dumped in favor of euros. Bush crosses them at his nation's peril.

#### Collapse of dollar causes deep recession that results in US-China nuclear conflict

**Porter 6** ([Dave](http://www.blueoregon.com) , Director of Business Development-Structures at General Dynamics, “Oregon Steel”, Blue Oregon, 12-8, http://www.blueoregon.com/2006/12/ff\_oregon\_steel.html)

There could be a soft landing or a domestic and international disaster. As Clyde Prestowitz in ["Three Billion New Capitalists: The Great Shift of Wealth and Power to the East"](http://www.blueoregon.com/2006/12/:/www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/economy/july-dec05/prestowitz_8-15.html) writes: "The nightmare scenario - an economic 9/11 - is a sudden, massive sell-off of dollars; a world financial panic whose trigger might be as minor, relatively speaking, as the assassination of a second-rate archduke in a third-rate European city. A collapse of the dollar and its consequent abandonment as the world's reserve currency would create a deep recession in the United States. Gas and fuel prices would soar, anything imported would suddenly become much more expensive, interest rates would jump, as would unemployment. The "stagflation" of the 1970's - slow growth and high unemployment combined with double-digit interest rates-would look like a walk in the park. And since the United States is at present the world's only major net importer, all of the exporters that depend on it for their economic stability would suffer severely as well. It's the thought of these consequences that make the big dollar holders so nervous, and makes them, for now, hold on to their excess dollars." Our economy has been totally mismanged and it's scary. And beyond the worldwide economic ruin, international cooperation would break down and wars would erupt. Peoples around the world would be so vulnerable and angry that they would blame and envy their neighbors. I am particularly concerned about China-US relations during the rest of the 21st century. Both countries would be under severe stress in such a scenario. Nuclear exchanges would not be impossible. As I have argued in our proposal ["Developing the China Connection through Educational Programs,"](http://www.dennisrichardson.org/pdf/OBPchineseproposal.pdf) we need to give our children the skills to get through such a crisis.

\

#### Trade doesn’t solve war

Martin et. al. 8(Phillipe, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, and Centre for Economic Policy Research; Thierry MAYER, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, CEPII, and Centre for Economic Policy Research, Mathias THOENIG, University of Geneva and Paris School of Economics, The Review of Economic Studies 75)

Does globalization pacify international relations? The “liberal” view in political science argues that increasing trade flows and the spread of free markets and democracy should limit the incentive to use military force in interstate relations. This vision, which can partly be traced back to Kant’s Essay on Perpetual Peace (1795), has been very influential: The main objective of the European trade integration process was to prevent the killing and destruction of the two World Wars from ever happening again.1 Figure 1 suggests2 however, that during the 1870–2001 period, the correlation between trade openness and military conflicts is not a clear cut one. The first era of globalization, at the end of the 19th century, was a period of rising trade openness and multiple military conflicts, culminating with World War I. Then, the interwar period was characterized by a simultaneous collapse of world trade and conflicts. After World War II, world trade increased rapidly, while the number of conflicts decreased (although the risk of a global conflict was obviously high). There is no clear evidence that the 1990s, during which trade flows increased dramatically, was a period of lower prevalence of military conflicts, even taking into account the increase in the number of sovereign states.

#### Trade wars don’t escalate

Bradford 9 (Anu, Assistant Professor of Law at the University of Chicago Law School, Future of the WTO, http://uchicagolaw.typepad.com/faculty/2009/02/future-of-the-wto-governing-the-world-economy-beyond-trade.html)

Acknowledging this shift towards regionalism, Richard asks: “Will we see competition between blocs? Cooperation between them? What will be the implications for multilateralism?” China’s recent effort to build closer trade relations with its Asian neighbors is one of the most interesting developments. That trend is likely to continue. Greg seems correct in doubting the emergence of coherent rival geopolitical blocks. But the most important regional trade deals will be built around the US, EU and China. In addition, we will see a fragmented web of PTAs within, across and beyond the key trade regions. I would predict some competition but no confrontation among regional blocks. We may see attempts of the “big three” – the US, EU and China – to expand their spheres of economic influence though negotiating PTAs with other states, in particular the energy-rich states in the Middle East, Central Asia and Africa.
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#### Still links: ‘MARKET’ SOCIALISM CREATES A SLIPPERY SLOPE TOWARDS CAPITALISM

Harry **Magdoff**, editor, **and** Fred **Magdoff**, Professor, Plant and Soil Science, University of Vermont, “Approaching Socialism,” MONTHLY REVIEW v. 57 n. 3, July-August 20**05**. Available from the World Wide Web at: [www.monthlyreview.org/0705magdoffs1.htm](http://www.monthlyreview.org/0705magdoffs1.htm), accessed 4/12/06.

One of the most important lessons to be learned from China’s reversal in direction, in our view, is that so-called market socialism has an inner logic. One step leads to another down a slippery slope toward capitalism. The defenders of the reversal point to the fact that the state still owns the remaining nationalized companies. However, that too is changing. In February the State Council reported that it was now permissible for “private companies legally [to] engage in oil exploration, set up banks of a certain scale, provide telecommunications services and operate airlines. Other sectors now open include utilities, health and education, and defense” (Wall Street Journal, Feb 28, 2005). And as pointed out by a headline in the Financial Times (May 1, 2005)—“China gives go-ahead to sell state holdings.” This process has already begun. It is manifested in a sale of stock in four state-controlled companies, starting with “the Shanghai Zi Jiang Enterprise Group, a packaging maker; Sany Heavy Industry, which makes machinery; Tsinghua Tongfang, a computer company; and the Hebei Jinniu Energy Resources Company, a coal company” (International Herald Tribune, May 9, 2005).

#### CAPITALISM IS AN INERTIAL SYSTEM—ANY VESITAGE LEFT REMAINING BY THE PERMUTATION WILL INEVITABLY SPIN BACK UP. LIKE A MANY-HEADED HYDRA, IT WILL REGENERATE WITH EVERY ATTEMPT THAT ATTACKS THE INSTRUMENTS AS OPPOSSED TO THE SYSTEM ITSELF\*\*\*

KOVEL (Alger Hiss Prof. At Bard) 2002

[Joel, The Enemy of Nature, Zed Books, p. 142-3//wyo-tjc]

The value-term that subsumes everything into the spell of capital sets going a kind of wheel of accumulation, from production to consumption and back, spinning ever more rapidly as the inertial mass of capital grows, and generating its force field as a spinning magnet generates an electrical field. This phenomenon has important implications for the reformability of the system. Because capital is so spectral, and succeeds so well in ideologically mystifying its real nature, attention is constantly deflected from the actual source of eco-destabilization to the instruments by which that source acts. The real problem, however, is the whole mass of globally accumulated capital, along with the speed of its circulation and the class structures sustaining this. That is what generates the force field, in proportion to its own scale; and it is this force field, acting across the numberless points of insertion that constitute the ecosphere, that creates ever larger agglomerations of capital, sets the ecological crisis going, and keeps it from being resolved. For one fact may be taken as certain — that to resolve the ecological crisis as a whole, as against tidying up one corner or another, is radically incompatible with the existence of gigantic pools of capital, the force field these induce, the criminal underworld with which they connect, and, by extension, the elites who comprise the transnational bourgeoisie. And by not resolving the crisis as a whole, we open ourselves to the spectre of another mythical creature, the many-headed hydra, that regenerated itself the more its individual tentacles were chopped away. To realize this is to recognize that there is no compromising with capital, no schema of reformism that will clean up its act by making it act more greenly or efficiently We shall explore the practical implications of this thesis in Part III, and here need simply to restate the conclusion in blunt terms: green capital, or non-polluting capital, is preferable to the immediately ecodestructive breed on its immediate terms. But this is the lesser point, and diminishes with its very success. For green capital (or ‘socially/ecologically responsible investing’) exists, by its very capital-nature, essentially to create more value, and this leaches away from the concretely green location to join the great pool, and follows its force field into zones of greater concentration, expanded profitability — and greater ecodestruction.

## Link

#### RESISTANCE TO CAPITAL MUST BE A TOTAL NEGATION OF THE SYSTEM FROM OUT-SIDE OF GOVERNMENT—WHILE SOME INSIDE POLITICAL GAINS ARE POSSIBLE, THEY ARE TRUMPED BY THE ABILITY OF THE SYSTEM TO USE REFORMS TO RESTABILIZE CAPITAL AND MARGINALIZE LABOR AS A SOCIAL ALTERNATIVE

MESZAROS (Prof. Emeritus @ Univ. Sussex) 1995

[Istavan, Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition, p. 738// wyo]

Thus the role of labour’s extra-parliamentary movement is twofold. On the one hand, it has to assert its strategic interests as a social metabolic alternative by confronting and forcefully negating in practical terms the structural determinations of the established order as manifest in the capital-relation and in the concomitant subordination of labour in the socioeconomic reproduction process, instead of helping to restabiize capital in crisis as it happened at important junctures of the reformist past. At the same time, on the other hand, the political power of capital which prevails in parliament needs to be and can be challenged through the pressure which extra-parliamentary forms of action can exercise on the legislative and executive, as witnessed by the impact of even the ‘single issue’ anti-poll-tax movement which played a major role in the fall of Margaret Thatcher from the top of the political pyramid. Without a strategically oriented and sustained extra-parliamentary challenge the parties alternating in government can continue to function as convenient reciprocal alibis for the structural failure of the system towards labour, thus effectively confining the role of the labour movement to its position as an inconvenient but marginalizable afterthought in capital’s parliamentary system. Thus in relation to both the material reproductive and the political domain, the constitution of a strategically viable socialist extra-parliamentaty mass movement — in conjunction with the traditional forms of labour’s, at present hopelessly derailed, political organization, which badly needs the radicalizing pressure and support of such extra-parliamentary forces — is a vital precondition for countering the massive extra-parliamentary power of capital.

#### ‘MARKET’ SOCIALISM ONLY REPRODUCES THE CONDITIONS OF SOCIAL INEQUALITY

Harry **Magdoff**, editor, **and** Fred **Magdoff**, Professor, Plant and Soil Science, University of Vermont, “Approaching Socialism,” MONTHLY REVIEW v. 57 n. 3, July-August 20**05**. Available from the World Wide Web at: [www.monthlyreview.org/0705magdoffs1.htm](http://www.monthlyreview.org/0705magdoffs1.htm), accessed 4/12/06.

In economies controlled via markets, all four types of markets described above work to reproduce the class structure and meet the needs and desires of the owners of the means of production and the bureaucracy and other elite. The relationships of the markets to the social system they serve are generally absent from the market socialism models being designed. We see no value at this point to examine each one, but one example will illustrate the issue. One model holds that while a country’s assets would belong to all the people, economic units (factories, etc.) will be controlled and managed by the workers in each enterprise. Products will be sold in markets (thus providing information for managers to react to market trends), and the taxes paid by each enterprise will go to a common national pot, to be distributed to the country’s regions in proportion to the number of people living in the region. This sounds like democracy, but is it? Even the leading centers of capitalism have considerable differences in the standard of living among their regions. That is clearly the case in the United States, England, France, Germany, and Italy. In view of this, distribution of the surplus on an equal amount per capita basis would more likely lead to greater differences among regions. This is because the richer regions already have infrastructure and equipment in place to allow continued growth with an infusion of even more cash than they already get from exploiting the poorer regions. Compared to the wealthy regions, the poorer regions will need a greater expansion of their infrastructure—industrial equipment, homes, hospitals, and improved transportation. Therefore poorer regions require a much larger per capita share of national income if the socialist goal is to attain egalitarian conditions between regions and to overcome the arrangements whereby the richer regions draw income and wealth from the poorer ones. It is also reasonable to expect regional competition for the limited resources available. To avoid conflicts and waste, ways would have to be found to achieve coordination—in other words, national and regional planning. And if we consider global inequalities, these kinds of national market socialism models will only reproduce the existing disproportions.
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#### THE ELITE WILL ACCEPT TRANSITION – THEY HAVE AS MUCH TO GAIN AND LOSE AS EVERYONE

PAELHKE (Prof. Poli Sci @ Trent University) 2003

[Robert, “Environmentalism and Progressive Politics”, Explorations in Environmental Political Theory, ed. Kassiola, M.E. Sharpe //mac-tjc]

Why would one even imagine that the rich in the rich countries would ever accept such outcomes? For one reason, environmental damage ex­ported is environmental damage that will frequently find its way back home—on imported food, in climate warming, and in the worldwide movement of air, water, and wildlife. As well, extinct species are lost not just for all time, but to all humanity and all nature. People under­stand this increasingly. There is also a trade-off for the rich were they (we) to accept steady or even a modest decline in consumption over time. The trade-off commodity is time—shorter work weeks, earlier re­tirements, less consumption dominated, more leisure oriented lives. The environmental movement must come to be as global as the most global of corporations—to convey the price we all pay for ecological damage in distant locations—and it must come to advocate more explicitly a modest time for money trade-off as, simply, a better way to live.[p. 97]

#### THERE IS TRULY NO VALUE TO LIFE IN THIS WORLD—THE MORAL ORDER, ENFORCED BY AMERICAN HEGEMONY, IS PURCHASED THROUGH THE LOGIC OF EXTERMINATION. GENOCIDE BECOMES THE ONLY POLITICAL SOLUTION

SHAW (Prof Int’l Relations and Politics at University of Sussex) 2000

[Martin, “The Contemporary Mode of Warfare?”, International Political Economy, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 171-80 //wyo-tjc]

There is here something of a mismatch between Kaldor’s and some other contributions to Military Fordism, such as Schméder’s documentation of the continuing high levels, despite real reductions, of state military expenditures, and Lovering’s of rapidly transforming European defence industries. Achcar (1998) has pointed out that the US retains an enormous military capacity, and suggests that the only way to make strategic sense of it is to read the scenario of simultaneous wars against Iraq and North Korea as planning for simultaneous conflicts with Russia and China. Clearly, for all the downsizing, warfare for the big states is still about far more than managing new wars. All this suggests an afterlife, even more surreal than the Cold War itself, for what Kaldor (1990) termed the ‘imaginary war’. The United States and NATO still plan to fight massive interstate wars, even though the circumstances in which these wars could occur are now very difficult to envisage. Similarly, across the globe, state elites of all kinds maintain historically very high levels of military expenditures and dangerous military capacity, although their awareness both of interdependence on the one hand and the limitations of military force on the other are surely growing. One relation between the kind of war presupposed by these forces and expenditures, and the new wars of which Kaldor writes, is surely to be found in the overwhelming US preference for airpower. No one looking carefully at new wars can fail to be struck by the inappropriateness of aerial bombardment as the principal means of dealing with issues ranging from ethnic cleansing to terrorism and lack of cooperation with UN inspectors. Troops on the ground are universally understood to be a more appropriate primary military response in many situations, and far more compatible with the political and legal measures needed. In Bosnia, indeed, the US eventually succumbed to this logic in enforcing Dayton. So why does the US reach repeatedly for air strikes, and what is the significance of this policy? (An early example, the US attack on Libya, was examined in Thompson and Kaldor, 1986.) In part they are gesture politics, a way of looking tough - often timed to align with domestic crises - even if they achieve minimal real political results. In part bombing is a relatively cost-free way of attacking even significant state militaries like Serbia’s or Iraq’s, minimising risks to American lives and hence administrations’ political standing. But behind these factors is the whole mode of warfare derived from the Second World War and Cold War, centred on technologically-driven mass slaughter. This lives in on the hardware-centred ‘armament culture’ (Luckham, 1984) of the advanced modern militaries and the political elites who support them. Although this dominant form of warfare is now not just imaginary but virtual, the itch to realise all those computer-gamed scenarios in real explosions, immolating physical structures and if necessary living beings, is still powerful. Having invested such enormous resources in the most sophisticated technologies of destruction, states like the US and UK are hardly going to admit that the legitimate scope of modern militaries should be limited to a glorified armed form of policing, in support of international civil and legal power. The key question here is, of course, whether there remains a genocidal content to late-modern airpower. Clearly with computer-aided targetting, advanced airforces can attack cities without causing colossal loss of life. Even according to Iraqi sources, the death toll from the Anglo-American attacks on Iraq in 1998 - in which more firepower was used than during the 1991 attacks - resulted in fewer than 100 deaths: hardly genocidal? Even during the 1991 war, direct Iraqi civilian casualties from coalition bombing were certainly far fewer than military deaths. However, not only did genocidal episodes (the charred Amiriya shelter) lurk within ‘surgical’ bombardment, but the destruction of electricity and sewage supplies certainly produced - as the coalition clearly knew it would, and in that sense intended - far larger losses of civilian lives. In this sense civilian deaths were more than ‘collateral’, and the non-genocidal character of the air bombardment was more apparent than real. Genocidal war as the problem Even in contemporary, technologically-revolutionised uses of airpower, therefore, the exterminist implication lingers on, a limited expression of its still-present larger danger. What separates Bush and Clinton from Saddam Hussein and Milosevic is still the fine line which separated Roosevelt and Truman from Hitler: mass killing as an intended consequence, rather than an end in itself. The difference is that while Western powers are looking for ways of limiting the genocidal effects - or at least appearance - of war, for the main protagonists of new wars genocide is not just one end among several (as it was for Hitler) but the principal business of war. Saddam and Milosevic are important links in the chain of contemporary warfare which links the Pentagon with the machete-killers of Rwanda and the weekend snipers of Serbia-Montenegro. Although Kaldor’s account emphasises external state support for new warriors, by focussing on Bosnia rather than Croatia in 1991 she underemphasises the role of conventional state military forces, and indeed of Milosevic. Similarly the general absence of Iraq loses from her account the state and leader responsible for initiating the two most important interstate wars of the last twenty years together with the most repeated genocidal wars against civilian populations. In short, Kaldor restricts the significance of new wars by over-emphasising their separation from continuing inter-state war, and by understating how far genocidal tendencies have come to dominate in contemporary war as a whole. Increasingly states (not only Serbia and Iraq but also Russia in Chechnya, Israel in the West Bank and Lebanon) go to war because of uncertainty in their control over ‘their’ territory, and these wars are directed largely against civilian populations. With the loss of Cold War narratives, particularly war as revolution, what is left is the logic of war as genocide. Although we need to be critical of the media construction of Saddam as Hitler, the main difference is that he heads a third-tier state with uncertain control over its own territory rather than a military superpower. But precisely for this reason, the threat his regime poses is principally to the people of Iraq and immediately surrounding states, and for this reason his wars have been particularly genocidal. The reluctance to label recent wars as genocidal, compared to Hitler’s, mistakes the comparison. In the Nazi wars, the campaign against the Jews was secondary to interstate conflict. Most of the German population were not directly involved, if only because most victims of the Holocaust were Jews in conquered eastern Europe, and relatively few Jews remained in Germany itself (they were only one per cent of the population even in 1933, concentrated in larger urban areas: half had fled by 1939). In Bosnia, however, ethnic ‘cleansing’ was the principal aim of the Serbian (and Croatian) forces. Non-Serbs (and non-Croats) were a large minorities if not majorities in the Serbian- (and Croatian-) controlled areas, and locally-raised militia, police and local authorities - as well as many civilians - were involved directly in genocide. The latter, moreover, was double-edged: directed against ethnic groups and plural urban communities. In Rwanda, large numbers of the Hutu civilian population as well as state, militia and public authorities were mobilised to murder their neighbours. There was an amateurish quality to these genocides compared to the Nazis: but the recognition of Nazism in the Omarska camp, or of the Einsatzgruppen in the mass graves of Srebrenica, was no mistake. New wars, therefore, are genocidal wars. They carry the logic of exterminism in total war to the point where war is genocide. They emphasise more than ever that in modernity, war is the problem. This conclusion enables us to pose the question of appropriate responses more clearly. Recultivating ‘the warrior’s honour’, for which Ignatieff (1997) has argued, can at best be a partial solution. Cosmopolitan law-enforcement, which Kaldor advocates, is an alternative to war, and the kinds of military forces which it needs are glorified policemen. Reconstructing local legitimacy, and indeed constructing global legitimacy, ultimately requires Western and other major states to repudiate war as a solution, and to dismantle their potentially genocidal military structures which provide a framework of legitimacy for all the new warriors.