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### 2AC NATO Mod

#### Blank says early withdrawal crushes NATO- causes great power war

Brzezinski ‘9 (Zbigniew Brzezinski, U.S. National Security Adviser from 1977 to 1981. His most recent book is Second Chance: Three Presidents and the Crisis of American Superpower, September 2009 - October 2009, (Foreign Affairs, SECTION: Pg. 2 Vol. 88 No. 5, HEADLINE: An Agenda for NATO Subtitle: Toward a Global Security Web, p. Lexis, 2009)

ADJUSTING TO A TRANSFORMED WORLD And yet, it is fair to ask: Is NATO living up to its extraordinary potential? NATO today is without a doubt the most powerful military and political alliance in the world. Its 28 members come from the globe's two most productive, technologically advanced, socially modern, economically prosperous, and politically democratic regions. Its member states' 900 million people account for only 13 percent of the world's population but 45 percent of global GDP. NATO's potential is not primarily military. Although NATO is a collective-security alliance, its actual military power comes predominantly from the United States, and that reality is not likely to change anytime soon. NATO's real power derives from the fact that it combines the United States' military capabilities and economic power with Europe's collective political and economic weight (and occasionally some limited European military forces). Together, that combination makes NATO globally significant. It must therefore remain sensitive to the importance of safeguarding the geopolitical bond between the United States and Europe as it addresses new tasks. The basic challenge that NATO now confronts is that there are historically unprecedented risks to global security. Today's world is threatened neither by the militant fanaticism of a territorially rapacious nationalist state nor by the coercive aspiration of a globally pretentious ideology embraced by an expansive imperial power. The paradox of our time is that the world, increasingly connected and economically interdependent for the first time in its entire history, is experiencing intensifying popular unrest made all the more menacing by the growing accessibility of weapons of mass destruction -- not just to states but also, potentially, to extremist religious and political movements. Yet there is no effective global security mechanism for coping with the growing threat of violent political chaos stemming from humanity's recent political awakening. The three great political contests of the twentieth century (the two world wars and the Cold War) accelerated the political awakening of mankind, which was initially unleashed in Europe by the French Revolution. Within a century of that revolution, spontaneous populist political activism had spread from Europe to East Asia. On their return home after World Wars I and II, the South Asians and the North Africans who had been conscripted by the British and French imperial armies propagated a new awareness of anticolonial nationalist and religious political identity among hitherto passive and pliant populations. The spread of literacy during the twentieth century and the wide-ranging impact of radio, television, and the Internet accelerated and intensified this mass global political awakening. In its early stages, such new political awareness tends to be expressed as a fanatical embrace of the most extreme ethnic or fundamentalist religious passions, with beliefs and resentments universalized in Manichaean categories. Unfortunately, in significant parts of the developing world, bitter memories of European colonialism and of more recent U.S. intrusion have given such newly aroused passions a distinctively anti-Western cast. Today, the most acute example of this phenomenon is found in an area that stretches from Egypt to India. This area, inhabited by more than 500 million politically and religiously aroused peoples, is where NATO is becoming more deeply embroiled. Additionally complicating is the fact that the dramatic rise of China and India and the quick recovery of Japan within the last 50 years have signaled that the global center of political and economic gravity is shifting away from the North Atlantic toward Asia and the Pacific. And of the currently leading global powers -- the United States, the EU, China, Japan, Russia, and India -- at least two, or perhaps even three, are revisionist in their orientation. Whether they are "rising peacefully" (a self-confident China), truculently (an imperially nostalgic Russia) or boastfully (an assertive India, despite its internal multiethnic and religious vulnerabilities), they all desire a change in the global pecking order. The future conduct of and relationship among these three still relatively cautious revisionist powers will further intensify the strategic uncertainty. Visible on the horizon but not as powerful are the emerging regional rebels, with some of them defiantly reaching for nuclear weapons. North Korea has openly flouted the international community by producing (apparently successfully) its own nuclear weapons -- and also by profiting from their dissemination. At some point, its unpredictability could precipitate the first use of nuclear weapons in anger since 1945. Iran, in contrast, has proclaimed that its nuclear program is entirely for peaceful purposes but so far has been unwilling to consider consensual arrangements with the international community that would provide credible assurances regarding these intentions. In nuclear-armed Pakistan, an extremist anti-Western religious movement is threatening the country's political stability. These changes together reflect the waning of the post-World War II global hierarchy and the simultaneous dispersal of global power. Unfortunately, U.S. leadership in recent years unintentionally, but most unwisely, contributed to the currently threatening state of affairs. The combination of Washington's arrogant unilateralism in Iraq and its demagogic Islamophobic sloganeering weakened the unity of NATO and focused aroused Muslim resentments on the United States and the West more generally

## K

#### Alt doesn’t solve detention- engagement with international conventions is key

Jenks 11 (INDEFINITE DETENTION UNDER THE LAWS OF WAR Chris Jenks\* & Eric Talbot Jensen\*\* Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army Judge Advocate General's Corps. Presently serving as the Chief of the International Law Branch, Office of The Judge Advocate General, Washington D.C. The views expressed in this Article are those of the author and not The Judge Advocate General's Corps, the U.S. Army, or the Department of Defense. \*\* Visiting Assistant Professor, Fordham Law School. The authors wish to thank Sue Ann Johnson for her exceptional research and editing skills, and the organizers and attendees at both the 3rd Annual National Security Law Jtinior Faculty Workshop at the University of Texas School of Law, where we first discussed the ideas for this article, and the Stanford Law and Policy Review National Defense Symposium, where we first presented the finished product. STANFORD LAW & POLICY REVIEW [Vol. 22:1] Page Lexis)

Those who would deconstruct the law of war as applied to detention stemming from armed conflict with non state actors may achieve victory, but in an academic, and, practically speaking, pyrrhic sense. Arguing that the Geneva Conventions for Prisoners and Civilians do not, on their face, apply to members of al-Qaeda or the Taliban may be correct, and in more than one way. But in so arguing, the deconstructionist approach removes a large portion of intemationally recognized and accepted provisions for regulating detention associated with armed conflict—^the Geneva Conventions—^while leaving the underlying question of how to govern detention unanswered. At some point, even the deconstructionist must shift to positivism and propose an alternative, an alternative we submit would inevitably resemble that which is already extant in the law of war. Moreover, while there has been discussion about the strained application of the Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocols to states combating transnational terrorism, attempts at a new convention have gained little traction. Our approach is more an attempt at pragmatism than radicalism—there are individuals currently detained, purportedly indefinitely and under the law of war. Yet despite years of such detention, two administrations have provided little if any information on what exactly such detention means, how and by what it is govemed, and if and how it ends. Conflating aspects of internationally recognized law of war conventions allows for a transparent process that could be promulgated now. Whether for the up to fifty or so individuals currently detained at Guantanamo or for those who may be detained in the future, we posit that the law of war provides a legitimate model for indefinite detention. And, as the Walsh Report recognized,^' the longer detainees are held, the more concern for their individual situations must be given. We therefore analyze the complete protections provided by the law of war and advocate that all of them, over time and to varying degrees, be applied to the detainees in Guantanamo. In this way, detention under the laws of war can provide a humane system of indefinite detention that strikes the right balance between the security of the nation and the rights of individuals

#### **Their K of human rights makes politics impossible**

* Solves liberal criticisms – goes beyond teleological understanding of politics

Villa 10 (Dana R, Chichester, West Sussex, "Democratizing the Agon Nietzsche, Arendt, And the Agonistic Tendency In Recent Political Theory," <http://www.kafkapizechust.com/democratizing-the-agon-nietzsche-arendt-and-the-agonistic-tendency-in-recent-political-theory/423/>)

First, she gives a central place to action in her conception of the political. This sets her at odds with the liberal focus on institutions, procedures, interests, and “negative freedom” (the freedom from politics).[[18]](http://www.kafkapizechust.com/democratizing-the-agon-nietzsche-arendt-and-the-agonistic-tendency-in-recent-political-theory/423/#_edn18) But Arendt goes far beyond the affirmation of “public freedom” and “public happiness” that we encounter in the civic republican tradition. Like Nietzsche, she affirms the[[19]](http://www.kafkapizechust.com/democratizing-the-agon-nietzsche-arendt-and-the-agonistic-tendency-in-recent-political-theory/423/#_edn19) initiatory dimension of all genuine action, its radically innovative character. And, like Nietzsche, she affirms the contingency of human (and especially political) affairs, disdaining all teleological orderings and utilitarian criteria. For Arendt, the freedom of action is manifest in its capacity to transcend both the needs of life and the supposed necessity of history. The Nietzschean formula “the deed is everything” holds for her, since it is through deeds through initiatory political speech and actionthat human beings tear themselves away from the everyday, the repetitive, the merely reactive.[[20]](http://www.kafkapizechust.com/democratizing-the-agon-nietzsche-arendt-and-the-agonistic-tendency-in-recent-political-theory/423/#_edn20) Unlike Nietzsche, however, she insists that action properly occurs only in a public sphere characterized by relations of equality. Citing the Greek polis, she goes so far as to identify freedom with (political) equality.[[21]](http://www.kafkapizechust.com/democratizing-the-agon-nietzsche-arendt-and-the-agonistic-tendency-in-recent-political-theory/423/#_edn21) Human plurality the existence of diverse equalsis for her the sine qua non of political action. Indeed, all genuinely political action is, in fact, an “acting together.”[[22]](http://www.kafkapizechust.com/democratizing-the-agon-nietzsche-arendt-and-the-agonistic-tendency-in-recent-political-theory/423/#_edn22) Contra Nietzsche, rulership signals the end of political action, its dissolution into the instrumental and fundamentally unfree activity of command and obedience.[[23]](http://www.kafkapizechust.com/democratizing-the-agon-nietzsche-arendt-and-the-agonistic-tendency-in-recent-political-theory/423/#_edn23) Second, radical democrats are attracted by Arendt’s endorsement of the “fiercely agonal spirit,” which she sees as animating all genuine political action. Again like Nietzsche, Arendt turns to the Greeks in order to isolate the “immortalizing impulse,” the passion for greatness, as the specifically political passion.[[24]](http://www.kafkapizechust.com/democratizing-the-agon-nietzsche-arendt-and-the-agonistic-tendency-in-recent-political-theory/423/#_edn24) The impulse to distinguish oneself, to prove oneself the best of all, lies at the heart of action’s tremendous individualizing power. But while Nietzsche’s agonistic stance culminates in a heroic individualism, Arendt’s expressly political version dovetails with what she calls the “revolutionary spirit” and the spirit of resistance.[[25]](http://www.kafkapizechust.com/democratizing-the-agon-nietzsche-arendt-and-the-agonistic-tendency-in-recent-political-theory/423/#_edn25) Her examples are not virtuosic statesmen, but the spontaneous heroic action manifest in the American Revolution, the Paris Commune of 1871, the 1905 Russian Revolution, the French Resistance during World War II, and the Hungarian revolt of 1956. This makes it possible and plausible for contemporary agonists to assimilate her to “an activist, democratic politics of contest, resistance, and amendment.”[[26]](http://www.kafkapizechust.com/democratizing-the-agon-nietzsche-arendt-and-the-agonistic-tendency-in-recent-political-theory/423/#_edn26) And while radical democrats are generally quite skeptical of Arendt’s Nietzsche-inspired distinction between the social and the political, viewing it as an aristocratic excrescence, they applaud the spirit behind pronouncements like the following (from The Human Condition):

#### The alt gets coopted and paves the way for authoritarian environmentalism

Hailwood 4 (Simon HAILWOOD Philosophy @ Liverpool ‘4 How to be a Green Liberal p. 155-156)

For me, **the main worry** emerging from such considerations **is not that liberal societies are incapable of embracing meaningful change towards "eco-sanity"**, such that anarchism is the only hope. That hope seems more unrealistic - more utopian in that sense - than that of liberal reform. **The main worry is that those from the authoritarian end of the spectrum will convince people that the liberal mainstream is inherently incapable of reform, and** so **must be replaced by more coercive forms of green politics, and people from the radical left will help with the critique, provide no realistic, non-utopian alternative** themselves, **thus leaving the door open for the "Leviathan or oblivion" school: nakedly authoritarian, radically hierarchical programmes** regarding substantive political equality as an obstacle to progress. 10) Sometimes the point about the practical need to oppose the state is made with impatience about philosophy and abstract theorizing. This does not apply to Carter. But it does to Sale, for example, who denounces abstract philosophical discussion of ethical responses to the "environmental crisis", mainly because dithering over abstruse conceptual matters is to ignore the simple practical issue of scale. '°4 **It would be better if those with such powerful rhetorical skills used them to further the green cause as continuous with furthering the liberal cause against** more **reactionary elements**. Perhaps this is **particularly** true **in the USA, clearly the main player in the scientific-industrial-capitalist global order and, in terms of environmental policy agenda**, in various ways a beacon of unreconstructed unreason. **That would** probably **be of greater practical benefit than giving fellow citizens of the modern world a collection of quasi-religiose blueprinting ideas** coloured with the dismal tinge of an anxious instrumentalism. That is, **it seems more practically feasible to seek to work with the flow of modernity in order to help channel it on to a course more respectful of nature**. That it is, in principle, possible to do this within the terms of what is often taken to be the main political philosophy of modernity, has been the point of this book.

#### Human extinction comes first – turns the kritik

Matheny 07 (J. G. Matheny, Ph. D. candidate, Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, December 6, 2007, “Ought we worry about human extinction?,” online: <http://jgmatheny.org/extinctionethics.htm>)

Moral philosophers have not written much about human extinction. This may be because they underestimate the potential benefits of human survival and/or the risks of human extinction. If we survive the next few centuries, humanity could allow Earth-originating life to survive a trillion years or more. If we do not survive, Earth-originating life will probably perish within a billion years. If prolonging the survival of Earth-originating life is morally important, then there may be nothing more important than reducing the near-term risks of human extinction. Keywords: extinction, population ethics, intergenerational justice, catastrophic risk, existential risk, risk analysis, animal welfare, environmental ethics Word count: 3,400 Introduction It was only in the last century, with the invention of nuclear weapons, that the probability of human extinction could be appreciably affected by human action. Ever since, human extinction has generally been considered a terrible possibility. It’s surprising, then, that a search of JSTOR and the Philosopher’s Index suggests contemporary philosophers have written little about the ethics of human extinction. In fact, they seem to have written more about the extinction of other animals. Maybe this is because they consider human extinction impossible or inevitable; or maybe human extinction seems inconsequential compared to other moral issues. In this paper I argue that the possibility of human extinction deserves more attention. While extinction events may be very improbable, their consequences are grave. Human extinction would not only condemn to non-existence all future human generations, it would also cut short the existence of all animal life, as natural events will eventually make Earth uninhabitable. The value of future lives Leslie (1996) suggests philosophers’ nonchalance toward human extinction is due in large part to disagreements in population ethics. Some people suppose it does not matter if the number of lives lived in the future is small -- at its limit, zero.[2] In contrast, I assume here that moral value is a function of both the quality and number of lives in a history.[3] This view is consistent with most people’s intuition about extinction (that it’s bad) and with moral theories under which life is considered a benefit to those who have it, or under which life is a necessary condition for producing things of value (Broome, 2004; Hare, 1993; Holtug 2001, Ng, 1989; Parfit 1984; Sikora, 1978). For instance, some moral theories value things like experiences, satisfied preferences, achievements, friendships, or virtuous acts, which take place only in lives. On this view, an early death is bad (at least in part) because it cuts short the number of these valuable things. Similarly, on this view, an early extinction is bad (at least in part) because it cuts short the number of these valuable things. I think this view is plausible and think our best reasons for believing an early death is bad are our best reasons for believing an early extinction is bad. But such a view is controversial and I will not settle the controversy here. I start from the premise that we ought to increase moral value by increasing both the quality and number of lives throughout history. I also take it, following Singer (2002), this maxim applies to all sentient beings capable of positive subjective feelings. Life’s prospects The human population is now 6 billion (6 x 109). There are perhaps another trillion (1012) sentient animals on Earth, maybe a few orders more, depending on where sentience begins and ends in the animal kingdom (Gaston, Blackburn, and Goldewijk, 2003; Gaston and Evans, 2004). Animal life has existed on Earth for around 500 million years. Barring a dramatic intervention, all animal life on Earth will die in the next several billion years. Earth is located in a field of thousands of asteroids and comets. 65 million years ago, an asteroid 10 kilometers in size hit the Yucatan , creating clouds of dust and smoke that blocked sunlight for months, probably causing the extinction of 90% of animals, including dinosaurs. A 100 km impact, capable of extinguishing all animal life on Earth, is probable within a billion years (Morrison et al., 2002). If an asteroid does not extinguish all animal life, the Sun will. In one billion years, the Sun will begin its Red Giant stage, increasing in size and temperature. Within six billion years, the Sun will have evaporated all of Earth’s water, and terrestrial temperatures will reach 1000 degrees -- much too hot for amino acid-based life to persist. If, somehow, life were to survive these changes, it will die in 7 billion years when the Sun forms a planetary nebula that irradiates Earth (Sackmann, Boothroyd, Kraemer, 1993; Ward and Brownlee, 2002). Earth is a dangerous place and animal life here has dim prospects. If there are 1012 sentient animals on Earth, only 1021 life-years remain. The only hope for terrestrial sentience surviving well beyond this limit is that some force will deflect large asteroids before they collide with Earth, giving sentients another billion or more years of life (Gritzner and Kahle, 2004); and/or terrestrial sentients will colonize other solar systems, giving sentients up to another 100 trillion years of life until all stars begin to stop shining (Adams and Laughlin, 1997). Life might survive even longer if it exploits non-stellar energy sources. But it is hard to imagine how life could survive beyond the decay of nuclear matter expected in 1032 to 1041 years (Adams and Laughlin, 1997). This may be the upper limit on the future of sentience.[4] Deflecting asteroids and colonizing space could delay the extinction of Earth-originating sentience from 109 to 1041 years. Assuming an average population of one trillion sentients is maintained (which is a conservative assumption under colonization[5]), these interventions would create between 1021 and 1053[billion] life-years. At present on Earth, only a human civilization would be remotely capable of carrying out such projects. If humanity survives the next few centuries, it’s likely we will develop technologies needed for at least one of these projects. We may already possess the technologies needed to deflect asteroids (Gritzner and Kahle, 2004; Urias et al., 1996). And in the next few centuries, we’re likely to develop technologies that allow colonization. We will be strongly motivated by self-interest to colonize space, as asteroids and planets have valuable resources to mine, and as our survival ultimately requires relocating to another solar system (Kargel, 1994; Lewis, 1996). Extinction risks Being capable of preserving sentient life for another 1041 years makes human survival important. There may be nothing more important. If the human species is extinguished, all known sentience and certainly all Earth-originating sentience will be extinguished within a few billion years. We ought then pay more attention to what Bostrom (2002) has called “existential risks” -- risks “where an adverse outcome would either annihilate Earth-originating intelligent life or permanently and drastically curtail its potential.” Such risks include: an asteroid or comet strikes Earth, creating enough debris to shut down photosynthesis for months; a supervolcano erupts, creating enough debris to shut down photosynthesis; a nearby supernova unleashes deadly radiation that reaches Earth; greenhouse gasses cause a radical change in climate; a nuclear holocaust creates enough debris to cause a “nuclear winter,” shutting down photosynthesis; a genetically engineered microbe is unleashed, by accident or design, killing most or all of humanity; or a high-energy physics experiment goes awry, creating a “true” vacuum or strangelets, destroying the Earth (Bostrom 2002; Bostrom and Cirkovic 2006; Leslie 1996, Posner 2004, Rees 2003). To me, most of these risks seem very unlikely. But dishearteningly, in their catalogs of these risks, Britain ’s Astronomer Royal, Sir Martin Rees (2003), gives humanity 50-50 odds of surviving the next few centuries, and philosophers John Leslie (1996) and Nick Bostrom (2002) put our chances at 70% and 75%, respectively.

#### Your K ignores how positive human domain over the environment has been- give this select instances of management and control are justified

Younkins 4**--**Professor of Accountancy and Business Administration at Wheeling Jesuit University in West Virginia. (Edward, The Flawed Doctrine of Nature's Intrinsic Value, <http://www.quebecoislibre.org/04/041015-17.htm>)

Many environmentalists contend that nature has an intrinsic value, in and of itself, apart from its contributions to human well-being. They maintain that all created things are equal and should be respected as ends in themselves having rights to their own actualization without human interference. Ecological egalitarians defend biodiversity for its own sake and assign the rest of nature ethical status at least equal to that of human beings. Some even say that the collective needs of nonhuman species and inanimate objects must take precedence over man’s needs and desires. Animals, plants, rocks, land, water, and so forth, are all said to possess intrinsic value by their mere existence without regard to their relationship to individual human beings. ¶ Environmentalists erroneously assign human values and concern to an amoral material sphere. When environmentalists talk about the nonhuman natural world, they commonly attribute human values to it, which, of course, are completely irrelevant to the nonhuman realm. For example, “nature” is incapable of being concerned with the possible extinction of any particular ephemeral species. Over 99 percent of all species of life that have ever existed on earth have been estimated to be extinct with the great majority of these perishing because of nonhuman factors. Nature cannot care about “biodiversity.” Humans happen to value biodiversity because it reflects the state of the natural world in which they currently live. Without humans, the beauty and spectacle of nature would not exist – such ideas can only exist in the mind of a rational valuer. ¶ These environmentalists fail to realize that value means having value to some valuer. To be a value some aspect of nature must be a value to some human being. People have the capacity to assign and to create value with respect to nonhuman existents. Nature, in the form of natural resources, does not exist independently of man. Men, choosing to act on their ideas, transform nature for human purposes. All resources are man-made. It is the application of human valuation to natural substances that makes them resources. Resources thus can be viewed as a function of human knowledge and action. By using their rationality and ingenuity, men affect nature, thereby enabling them to achieve progress. ¶ Man’s survival and flourishing depend upon the study of nature that includes all things, even man himself. Human beings are the highest level of nature in the known universe. Men are a distinct natural phenomenon as are fish, birds, rocks, etc. Their proper place in the hierarchical order of nature needs to be recognized. Unlike plants and animals, human beings have a conceptual faculty, free will, and a moral nature. Because morality involves the ability to choose, it follows that moral worth is related to human choice and action and that the agents of moral worth can also be said to have moral value. By rationally using his conceptual faculty, man can create values as judged by the standard of enhancing human life. The highest priority must be assigned to actions that enhance the lives of individual human beings. It is therefore morally fitting to make use of nature. ¶ Man’s environment includes all of his surroundings. When he creatively arranges his external material conditions, he is improving his environment to make it more useful to himself. Neither fixed nor finite, resources are, in essence, a product of the human mind through the application of science and technology. Our resources have been expanding over time as a result of our ever-increasing knowledge. ¶ Unlike plants and animals, human beings do much more than simply respond to environmental stimuli. Humans are free from nature’s determinism and thus are capable of choosing. Whereas plants and animals survive by adapting to nature, men sustain their lives by employing reason to adapt nature to them. People make valuations and judgments. Of all the created order, only the human person is capable of developing other resources, thereby enriching creation. The earth is a dynamic and developing system that we are not obliged to preserve forever as we have found it. Human inventiveness, a natural dimension of the world, has enabled us to do more with less. ¶ Those who proclaim the intrinsic value of nature view man as a destroyer of the intrinsically good. Because it is man’s rationality in the form of science and technology that permits him to transform nature, he is despised for his ability to reason that is portrayed as a corrupting influence. The power of reason offends radical environmentalists because it leads to abstract knowledge, science, technology, wealth, and capitalism. This antipathy for human achievements and aspirations involves the negation of human values and betrays an underlying nihilism of the environmental movement.

#### Human-centeredness is key to environmental sustainability- the alt is net worse for everything

**Schmidtz 2k – Professor of Philosophy @ Arizona**

David Schmidtz, 2k. Philosophy, University of Arizona, Environmental Ethics, p. 379-408

Like economic reasoning, ecological reasoning is reasoning about equilibria and perturbations that keep systems from converging on equilibria. Like economic reasoning, ecological reasoning is reasoning about competition and unintended consequences, and the internal logic of systems, a logic that dictates how a system responds to attempts to manipulate it. Environmental activism and regulation do not automatically improve the environment. It is a truism in ecology, as in economics, that well-intentioned interventions do not necessarily translate into good results. Ecology (human and nonhuman) is complicated, our knowledge is limited, and environmentalists are themselves only human. Intervention that works with the system’s logic rather than against it can have good consequences. Even in a centrally planned economy, the shape taken by the economy mainly is a function not of the central plan but of how people respond to it, and people respond to central plans in ways that best serve their purposes, not the central planner’s. Therefore, even a dictator is in no position simply to decide how things are going to go. Ecologists understand that this same point applies in their own discipline. They understand that an ecology’s internal logic limits the directions in which it can be taken by would-be ecological engineers. Within environmental philosophy, most of us have come around to something like Aldo Leopold’s view of humans as plain citizens of the biotic community.[[21]](http://www.theihs.org/libertyguide/hsr/hsr.php?id=41&print=1" \l "_ftn22) As Bryan Norton notes, the contrast between anthropocentrism and biocentrism obscures the fact that we increasingly need to be nature-centered to be properly human-centered; we need to focus on "saving the ecological systems that are the context of human cultural and economic activities." [[22]](http://www.theihs.org/libertyguide/hsr/hsr.php?id=41&print=1" \l "_ftn23) If we do not tend to what is good for nature, we will not be tending to what is good for people either. As Gary Varner recently put it, on purely anthropocentric grounds we have reason to think biocentrically.[[23]](http://www.theihs.org/libertyguide/hsr/hsr.php?id=41&print=1" \l "_ftn24) I completely agree. What I wish to add is that the converse is also true: on purely biocentric grounds, we have reason to think anthropocentrically. We need to be human-centered to be properly nature-centered, for if we do not tend to what is good for people, we will not be tending to what is good for nature either. From a biocentric perspective, preservationists sometimes are not anthropocentric enough. They sometimes advocate policies and regulations with no concern for values and priorities that differ from their own. Even from a purely biocentric perspective, such slights are illegitimate. Policy makers who ignore human values and human priorities that differ from their own will, in effect, be committed to mismanaging the ecology of which those ignored values and priorities are an integral part.

### 2AC AT: Root Cause

#### No single cause of violence

Muro-Ruiz 2 (Diego, London School of Economics, “The Logic of Violence”, Politics, 22(2), p. 116)

Violence is, most of the time, a wilful choice, especially if it is made by an organisation. Individuals present the scholar with a more difficult case to argue for. Scholars of violence have now a wide variety of perspectives they can use – from sociology and political science, to psychology, psychiatry and even biology – and should escape easy judgements. However, the fundamental difficulty for all of us is the absence of a synthetic, general theory able of integrating less complete theories of violent behaviour. In the absence of such a general theory, researchers should bear in mind that violence is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that resists mono-causal explanations. Future research on violence will have to take in account the variety of approaches, since they each offer some understanding of the logic of violence.

## CP

### 2AC Self-Restraint CP

#### Links to the net-benefit

Howell 5 (William G. Howell, Associate Prof Gov Dep @ Harvard 2005 (Unilateral Powers: A Brief Overview; Presidential Studies Quarterly, Vol. 35, Issue: 3, Pg 417)

Plainly, presidents cannot institute every aspect of their policy agenda by decree. The checks and balances that define our system of governance are alive, though not always well, when presidents contemplate unilateral action. Should the president proceed without statutory or constitutional authority, the courts stand to overturn his actions, just as Congress can amend them, cut funding for their operations, or eliminate them outright. (4) Even in those moments when presidential power reaches its zenith--namely, during times of national crisis--judicial and congressional prerogatives may be asserted (Howell and Pevehouse 2005, forthcoming; Kriner, forthcoming; Lindsay 1995, 2003; and see Fisher's contribution to this volume). In 2004, as the nation braced itself for another domestic terrorist attack and images of car bombings and suicide missions filled the evening news, the courts extended new protections to citizens deemed enemy combatants by the president, (5) as well as noncitizens held in protective custody abroad. (6) And while Congress, as of this writing, continues to authorize as much funding for the Iraq occupation as Bush requests, members have imposed increasing numbers of restrictions on how the money is to be spent.

#### Sequencing DA- court action has to come first to solve the aff

Waxman 9 (Matthew- Professor of Law; Faculty Chair, Roger Hertog Program on Law and National Security, “Legislating the War on Terror: An Agenda for Reform”, November 3, Book)

Judicial review can help safeguard liberty and enhance the credibility at¶ home and abroad of administrative detention decisions by ensuring the neutrality of the decisionmaker and publicly certifying the legality of the detention in question. Most calls for reform of existing detention laws start with a strong role for courts. Some commentators believe that a special court is¶ needed, perhaps a “national security court» made up of designated judges¶ who would build expertise in terrorism cases over time.’6 Others suggest that¶ the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court already has judges with expertise¶ in handling sensitive intelligence matters and mechanisms in place to ensure¶ secrecy, so its jurisdiction ought to be expanded to handle detention cases.’7¶ Still others insist that specialized terrorism courts are dangerous; the legitimacy of a detention system can best be ensured by giving regular, generalist¶ judges a say in each decision.¶ Adversarial process and access to attorneys can help further protect liberty¶ and enhance the perceived legitimacy of detention systems. As with judicial¶ review, however, proposals tend to split over how best to organize and ensure¶ that process. Some argue that habeas corpus suits are the best check on administrative detention.’ Others argue that administrative detention decisions¶ should be contested at an early stage by a lawyer of the detainee’s choosing.”¶ Still others recognize an imperative need for secrecy and deep expertise in terrorism and intelligence matters that calls for designating a special “defense¶ bar” operated by the government on detainees’ behalf?¶ The issue of secrecy runs in tension with a third common element of procedural and institutional reform proposals: openness and transparency. The¶ Bush administration’s approach was considered by some to be prone to error¶ in part because of its excessive secrecy and hostility to the prying courts and¶ Congress as well as to the press and advocacy groups. Critics and reformists¶ argue that hearings should be open or at least partially open and that judgments should be written so that they can be scrutinized later by the public or¶ congressional oversight committees; that, they claim, would help put pressure¶ on the executive branch to exercise greater care in deciding which detention¶ cases to pursue and put pressure on adjudicators to act in good faith and with¶ more diligence.2’¶ These three elements of procedural design reform—judicial review, adversarial process, and transparency—may help reduce the likelihood of mistakes¶ and restore the credibility of detention decisionmaking. Rarely, though, do the¶ discussions pause long on the antecedent question of what it is that the¶ courts—however constituted—will evaluate. Judicial review of what? A meaningful opportunity to contest what with the assistance of counsel? Transparent determinations of what?

**Executive doesn’t solve perception**

Ashley **Deeks**, Academic Fellow at Columbia Law School and senior contributor to Lawfare, “Promises Not to Torture: Diplomatic Assurances in U.S. Courts”, The American Society of International Law, 20**08**, http://www.asil.org/files/ASIL-08-DiscussionPaper.pdf (BJN)

Human rights groups have been the most vocal opponents of assurances, and often represent in court individuals who are contesting their transfers by the U.S. government. Many groups have called for a total ban, while others have sought more stringent monitoring mechanisms to give teeth to the assurances.222 Critics claim that current practice shrouds the assurances in a veil of secrecy. At the same time, the fact that only the Executive Branch reviews the assurances leads these critics to conclude that the decision-maker has a vested interest in concluding that the assurances are reliable. In part because the Executive Branch faces widespread criticism over issues related to detention, Guantanamo, and torture, a unilateral reliance by the Executive Branch on assurances (which the public associates with all three issues) is viewed with similar skepticism. The criticisms may have gained additional traction in the public’s mind because the U.S. government has not responded directly to these criticisms.

#### CP doesn’t solve- legal certainty is key

Guiora 12 (Professor of Law, S.J. Quinney College of Law, University of Utah; author of Freedom from Religion: Rights and National Security (2009). DUE PROCESS AND COUNTERTERRORISM EMORY INTERNATIONAL LAW REVIEW [Vol. 26 pg Lexis Nexis]

While President Obama signed an Executive Order ordering the closure of the Guantanamo Bay detention center26 for the purpose of discontinuing trials before Military Commissions, in April 2010 the Obama Administration reinstituted the Military Commissions.27 It is unclear whether this represents reversal of a policy previously articulated but not implemented, or a stopgap measure. Whatever the explanation, the Obama Administration has largely failed to satisfactorily address the rule-of-law questions essential to creating and implementing counterterrorism policy that ensures implementation of due process guarantees and obligations. For example, the Administration has failed to resolve whether Article III courts are the proper judicial forums for suspected terrorists.28 Perhaps this continuing failure is reflective of political infighting, as demonstrated in the backtracking with respect to Khalid Sheikh Mohammed’s trial.29 The result is a disturbing failure to ensure due process for individuals suspected of involvement in terrorism. More fundamentally, the status of individuals detained post-9/11 has not been uniformly or consistently articulated or applied. That is, varying definitions have been articulated at different times, reflecting legal and policy uncertainty directly affecting the ability to establish and consistently apply a legal regime based on due process.30 For thousands of individuals whose initial detention was based on questionable intelligence and subsequent, inadequate habeas protections, the current regime is inherently devoid of due process.31 I propose that detainees are neither prisoners of war nor criminals in the traditional sense; rather, they are a hybrid of both. To that end, I propose that the appropriate term for post-9/11 detainees is a combination—a convergence of the criminal law and law of war paradigms—best described as a hybrid paradigm.

#### The possibility of future presidential rollback magnifies the deficits

Friedersdorf 13 (CONOR FRIEDERSDORF, staff writer, “Does Obama Really Believe He Can Limit the Next President's Power?” MAY 28 2013, <http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/05/does-obama-really-believe-he-can-limit-the-next-presidents-power/276279/>, KB)

Obama doesn't seem to realize that his legacy won't be shaped by any perspicacious limits he places on the executive branch, if he ever gets around to placing any on it. The next president can just undo those "self-imposed" limits with the same wave of a hand that Obama uses to create them. His influence in the realm of executive power will be to expand it. By 2016 we'll be four terms deep in major policy decisions being driven by secret memos from the Office of Legal Counsel. The White House will have a kill list, and if the next president wants to add names to it using standards twice as lax as Obama's, he or she can do it, in secret, per his precedent.

#### Exectuive self restraint is illegit- 1- topic eduction- creates a topic centered on judicial/statutory action good, not war powers good/bad, 2- object fiat- the rez was created because the CP isn’t a possibility- proves the CP is anti-educaitonal and unpredictable, 3- (no solvency advocate)- independent reason to reject the CP, no aff specific evidence proves debating the CP is worthless

### 2AC Codify

#### It’s gotta be a law on the books

Gregory Shaffer 11, Professor of Law, University of Minnesota Law School, and Mark Pollack, Professor of Political Science and Jean Monnet Chair, Temple University., Sept, ARTICLE: HARD VERSUS SOFT LAW IN INTERNATIONAL SECURITY, 52 B.C. L. Rev 1147

To effect specific policy goals, state and private actors increasingly turn to legal instruments that are harder or softer in manners that best align with such proposals. n79 These variations in precision, obligation, and third-party delegation can be used strategically to advance both international and domestic policy goals. Much of the existing literature examines the relative strengths and weaknesses of hard and soft law for the states that make it. It is important, for our purposes, to address these purported advantages in order to assess the implications of the interaction of hard and soft law on each other.¶ Hard law as an institutional form features a number of advantages. n80 Hard law instruments, for example, allow states to commit themselves more credibly to international agreements by increasing the costs of reneging. They do so by imposing legal sanctions or by raising the costs to a state's reputation where the state has acted in violation of its legal commitments. n81 In addition, hard law treaties may have the advantage of creating direct legal effects in national jurisdictions, again increasing the incentives for compliance. n82 They may solve problems of incomplete contracting by creating mechanisms for the interpretation and elaboration of legal commitments over time, n83 including through the use of dispute settlement bodies such as courts. n84 In different ways, they thus permit states to monitor, clarify, and enforce their commitments. Hard law, as a result, can create more legal certainty. States, as well as private actors working with and through state representatives, [\*1163] should use hard law where "the benefits of cooperation are great but the potential for opportunism and its costs are high." n85

### Water Wars

#### Credible human rights promotion allows for cooperation that solves water wars- convention ruling is key

Varma, 13 (Director of Robert F. Kennedy Center for Justice and Human Rights, 9/9, “Wòch nan soley: The denial of the right to water in Haiti,” http://www.hhrjournal.org/2013/09/09/woch-nan-soley-the-denial-of-the-right-to-water-in-haiti/)

In addition to protections in domestic law, **the right to water is** also **recognized in international** **law**. International and regional human rights bodies and national and international courts have interpreted the right to water as being an implicit part of other human rights, such as the right to life, the right to health, the right to an adequate standard of living, the right to food, the right to housing, and the right to education.117 These rights have **been enshrined in** both UN and regional **human rights instruments**, several of which have been **ratified by** Haiti and the United States. Both Haiti and the United States have ratified the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), which protects, inter alia, the right to life. Both have signed the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), which includes, inter alia, the right to housing, food, health, and an adequate standard of living.118 The right to water is also protected under other international instruments. These instruments are useful indicators of norms accepted by the international community and reflect evidence of political will to make access to water a priority. The provisions in some international instruments have obtained the status of customary international law and thus create legal obligations for states. Customary international law is derived from a clear consensus among states as to a legal rule, which is evidenced by widespread conduct by states accompanied by a sense of legal obligation to adhere to such rule, known as opinio juris.119 The UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ESCR Committee) has found that the minimum core of the main economic, social, and cultural rights has become customary international law and is thus binding on all states, regardless of whether they have signed or ratified treaties protecting those rights. Many scholars support this position.120 The right to life is further protected by customary international law, and as a necessary component of the right to life, the right to water is thus implicitly protected by customary international law.121 International instruments that may reflect customary international law and that protect the right to water, either explicitly or implicitly, include the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Declaration on the Right to Development, and the Millennium Development Goals.122 States’ treaty-based obligations to secure Haitians’ right to water As the situation in Haiti makes clear, **legal rights provide no real protection for individuals without corresponding responsibilities, and the responsibility for fulfilling rights is an integral part of all legal rights**. Generally, the government of each state bears the primary responsibility to ensure the protection and achievement of human rights for those on its territory or otherwise under its jurisdiction. A state’s human rights obligations also apply when it acts as part of a multilateral or international organization, such as the UN or the World Bank.123 Thus, members of the international community bear a measure of legal responsibility. The case of water in Haiti is **directly relevant to the issue of international human rights law as codified in treaties** and under customary international law. When a state signs a treaty, the state is required to refrain from any action that would contradict the object and purpose of the treaty, and when a state ratifies a treaty, the state thereby accepts the duties contained within the treaty and is required to immediately take positive steps to realize the rights contained in the treaty.124 Even if a state has neither signed nor ratified a human rights treaty, it has certain obligations under customary international law, which protects fundamental human rights and in general applies to all states. Types of duties Human rights treaties generally specify three different kinds of duties relating to the rights set out in the treaty. The first is the obligation to respect, meaning that governments must refrain from interfering directly or indirectly with an individual’s enjoyment of rights. The second is the obligation to protect, meaning that governments must prevent the violation of human rights by other actors. States’ actions to protect include actions that prevent individuals, companies, or other entities from violating individuals’ human rights, and also actions to investigate and punish such violations if they occur. And the third duty is the obligation to fulfill, meaning that governments must adopt whatever measures are necessary to achieve the full realization of human rights for all. Thus, governments are required to provide subsidies, services, or other direct assistance to the most vulnerable and needy members of a society when they cannot otherwise access their rights. Obligations of the government of Haiti In accordance with these treaty-based obligations and customary international law, the Haitian government is responsible for guaranteeing and fulfilling the human rights of everyone in Haiti.125 Haiti is a party to the ICCPR, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Organization of American States (OAS) Charter, and the American Convention on Human Rights; it is thus responsible for all the obligations found within each of these treaties. The Haitian government has signed, but not yet ratified, the ICESCR and the Protocol of San Salvador, both of which enumerate many of the rights at issue in this article; thus, these treaties do not strictly bind the government of Haiti. However, as a signatory, Haiti has an obligation to refrain from actions that will frustrate the object and purpose of these treaties.126 Furthermore, given that the Haitian Constitution protects the rights to health and food, the Haitian government has an obligation to ensure the satisfaction of — at the very least — minimum essential levels of each of these rights, of which access to water is an integral component. All Haitians, as rights-holders, have a particular set of entitlements, and the Haitian state, as the primary duty-bearer, has a particular set of obligations. Haitians who cannot access even the most basic forms of these entitlements are being deprived of their constitutional economic and social rights and their rights under treaties guaranteeing basic civil and political rights, such as the right to life, personal liberty, and security.127 The Haitian Constitution requires the Haitian government to recognize and protect Haitians’ rights to health, decent housing, education, and food.128 Because the right to water is an important component of these rights, the Haitian government has a responsibility to ensure the full realization of the right to water through national legislation and policies. A national water strategy should elaborate how the right to water is to be realized and should include concrete goals, policies, and a time frame for implementation.129 Obligations of the international community While the government of Haiti is the primary guarantor of Haitians’ rights, the international community also has obligations.130 Human rights treaty obligations apply not only within the territory of the ratifying state, but also apply to states’ behavior outside of their borders, through the concept of jurisdiction, and to states’ actions as members of the international community.131 This means that states must protect the human rights of all individuals within their territory or under their jurisdiction and **ensure that their actions at the international level are in compliance with their human rights obligations**.132 With respect to the right to water, this means that states must “refrain from actions that interfere, directly or indirectly, with the enjoyment of the right to water in other countries.”133 The following brief summary of international obligations relevant to Haiti illustrates the importance of this factor in discussing Haitians’ right to water. Two types of state action are most pertinent to the denial of the right to water in Haiti: 1) when states act individually on the international level, and 2) when they act as members of international organizations, particularly international financial institutions (IFIs). The Maastricht Guidelines, developed to clarify which state actions constitute violations of economic, social, and cultural rights, assert that states’ duties to protect human rights extend to their “participation in international organizations, where they act collectively.”134 When authorized by member states, IFIs can take actions that may help fulfill human rights, such as financing the construction of the infrastructure needed to deliver and treat water. Alternatively, actions by IFIs may hinder the enjoyment of human rights, through, for example, requiring governments to minimize social programs or privatize core services as a precondition to receipt of grants or loans. IFI actions in such cases may interfere with the target state’s ability to fulfill human rights obligations.135 To effectively ensure the realization of the right to water, member states must be held accountable for the actions that they take, through IFIs, that have a direct impact on the human rights of individuals located outside their territory.136 At a minimum, member states must abide by their duty to respect human rights in their actions as members of IFIs.137 The ESCR Committee — responsible for interpreting and monitoring compliance with the ICESCR — has determined that states are bound by human rights obligations when acting as members of IFIs.138 With regard to the right to water, the Committee notes that “States parties that are members of international financial institutions, notably the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and regional development banks, should take steps to ensure that the right to water is taken into account in their lending policies, credit agreements and other international measures.”139 This statement further stipulates that “water should never be used as an instrument of political and economic pressure.”140 The majority of members of the World Bank Group and IMF (including the United States) are party to the ICCPR, which can be **seen as providing protections of the right to water as an element of the right to life, a right central to the ICCPR**.141 Also, since the ICESCR has been ratified by the majority of major IFI state members and all European Union countries, these states are obligated to comply with its provisions. The United States has not ratified the ICESCR, but it has signed the treaty, and thus must refrain from acting in a manner that would frustrate the object and purpose of the treaty.142 Many IDB member states are also members of the OAS, through which states may ratify regional treaties, including the American Convention and the Protocol of San Salvador, that protect economic and social rights. Moreover, the minimum core content of the key economic and social rights is regarded as customary international law, binding even non-ratifying states such as the United States. Thus, the action taken by the United States in blocking IDB development loans earmarked for water projects in Haiti is a **direct violation of** the **U**nited **S**tates’ **human rights obligations**.143 In this case, the United States actively impeded the Haitian state’s ability to fulfill Haitians’ human right to water through its actions, breaching its duty to respect. Such blatant frustration of the object and purpose of the human rights treaties to which the United States is a signatory or a state party is a clear violation of international law. Recommendation: Adopt a rights-based approach This article has documented the disastrous consequences of the IDB’s extended failure to disburse loans earmarked for water projects in Haiti. It has demonstrated how these actions directly impeded the Haitian government’s ability to respect, protect, and fulfill its citizens’ right to water. While the government of Haiti is primarily responsible for ensuring this right, other key actors, such as IFIs, foreign states, nongovernmental organizations, and private companies also have a role in solving Haiti’s water crisis. To ensure a sustainable solution, we recommend that all of these actors, in addition to the Haitian government, adopt a rights-based approach to the development and implementation of water projects. Such an approach would enhance the Haitian government’s ability to deliver these services and the Haitian population’s right to access safe and sufficient water. This section provides a brief explanation of a rights-based approach to development and its implications for water security in Haiti. A rights-based approach A rights-based approach to development is a conceptual framework that is based on international human rights law and methodology.144 It integrates the norms, standards, and principles of international human rights law into the plans, policies, and processes of development. A rights-based approach to development is based on five principles. First, a human rights-based approach shifts the language of development from charity to empowerment, viewing the beneficiary of development assistance as the owner of a right. The duty-bearer has a responsibility to develop access to the relevant rights to the rights-holder. Second, a rights-based approach considers the indivisibility and interdependence of interrelated rights (civil, cultural, economic, political, and social), recognizing that a policy affecting one right will necessarily have an impact on the others.145 Third, a rights-based approach requires non-discrimination and attention to vulnerable groups; that is, groups historically excluded from the political process and prohibited access to basic services must receive particular attention. Fourth, a rights-based approach to development ceases to be about charity and instead is about duty-bearers’ accountability to human rights obligations. In this case, accountability falls primarily on the government of Haiti, but also on the actions of donor states and private actors (for example, those providing public services) as they have obligations in particular situations. Transparency is crucial to increasing accountability.146 Finally, a rights-based approach requires duty-bearers to ensure a high degree of participation from communities, civil society, minorities, indigenous peoples, women, and other marginalized groups. Such participation must be active, free, and meaningful and must occur at each level of the development process.147 Measures to address and reduce structural participation inequalities or disadvantages may require appropriate preferential treatment to vulnerable and disadvantaged groups. Transparency is, again, essential. A rights-based approach to water projects in Haiti A rights-based approach to developing the water sector in Haiti requires all actors to incorporate each of these principles into their work. For example, effective participation requires that community members be involved in all efforts to improve the water situation. They should be consulted during the development of water projects, especially on issues such as water source, availability, sanitation precautions, time frames for implementation, water cost, and water quality. There must be regular consultations with the community during project development. Community members must have easy access to ongoing project information during implementation — for example, via posters, meetings, and radio programs. Such participation would help to ensure that water projects are empowering the Haitian people as rights-holders and that the projects are adequately and accurately meeting their needs. A rights-based approach also requires transparency of all efforts and actors involved in developing and implementing water projects in Haiti. There are several means to achieving this transparency. For example, since the government does not yet have the capacity to effectively regulate the private sector, groups responsible for water distribution or sale should also be responsible for regularly checking the safety of sources used for drinking water and publicizing test results. In addition, all water providers should report regularly on the status of projects, providing, at a minimum, information about available project funds, monies spent, specific timelines for implementation and completion, and any changes to original implementation plans. International entities might include mechanisms for transparency in their work in Haiti by providing readily-available public documentation of project status, including expenditures. Finally, a rights-based approach requires that each implementing entity has a clear and accessible accountability mechanism (or mechanisms) through which communities can report project problems. In Haiti’s case, this should include mechanisms for redress from all actors, including international organizations, states, IFIs, NGOs, and private entities. These mechanisms need to be locally focused and easily accessible, and they should have built-in transparency so that community members can follow the status of grievances or complaints and keep the public aware of their outcomes. Accountability also lies with the government, which should build internal accountability mechanisms into its national water strategy, with identifying benchmarks to measure the extent to which the right to water is being realized. The right to water has been compromised in Haiti for too long. **A rights-based approach is an essential strategy in the successful implementation and monitoring of** sustainable development projects, including **water projects**. While the government of Haiti is obligated to implement a rights-based approach, all entities involved in the development and implementation of water projects can contribute to fulfilling Haitians’ human rights by adopting this framework.

#### Outweighs their impacts- guarantees extinction

Barlow 8—National chairperson of The Council of Canadians. Co-founder of the Blue Planet Project. Chairs the board of Washington-based Food & Water Watch and is also an executive member of the San Francisco–based International Forum on Globalization and a Councillor with the Hamburg-based World Future Council. She is the recipient of eight honorary doctorates. Served as Senior Advisor on Water to the 63rd President of the United Nations General Assembly (Maude, The Global Water Crisis and the Coming Battle for the Right to Water, 25 February 2008, http://www.fpif.org/articles/the\_global\_water\_crisis\_and\_the\_coming\_battle\_for\_the\_right\_to\_water)

 The three water crises – dwindling freshwater supplies, inequitable access to water and the corporate control of water – pose the greatest threat of our time to the planet and to our survival. Together with impending climate change from fossil fuel emissions, the water crises impose some life-or-death decisions on us all. Unless we collectively change our behavior, we are heading toward a world of deepening conflict and potential wars over the dwindling supplies of freshwater – between nations, between rich and poor, between the public and the private interest, between rural and urban populations, and between the competing needs of the natural world and industrialized humans. Water Is Becoming a Growing Source of Conflict Between Countries Around the world, more that 215 major rivers and 300 groundwater basins and aquifers are shared by two or more countries, creating tensions over ownership and use of the precious waters they contain. Growing shortages and unequal distribution of water are causing disagreements, sometimes violent, and becoming a security risk in many regions. Britain’s former defense secretary, John Reid, warns of coming “water wars.” In a public statement on the eve of a 2006 summit on climate change, Reid predicted that violence and political conflict would become more likely as watersheds turn to deserts, glaciers melt and water supplies are poisoned. He went so far as to say that the global water crisis was becoming a global security issue and that Britain’s armed forces should be prepared to tackle conflicts, including warfare, over dwindling water sources. “Such changes make the emergence of violent conflict more, rather than less, likely,” former British prime minister Tony Blair told The Independent. “The blunt truth is that the lack of water and agricultural land is a significant contributory factor to the tragic conflict we see unfolding in Darfur. We should see this as a warning sign.” The Independent gave several other examples of regions of potential conflict. These include Israel, Jordan and Palestine, who all rely on the Jordan River, which is controlled by Israel; Turkey and Syria, where Turkish plans to build dams on the Euphrates River brought the country to the brink of war with Syria in 1998, and where Syria now accuses Turkey of deliberately meddling with its water supply; China and India, where the Brahmaputra River has caused tension between the two countries in the past, and where China’s proposal to divert the river is re-igniting the divisions; Angola, Botswana and Namibia, where disputes over the Okavango water basin that have flared in the past are now threatening to re-ignite as Namibia is proposing to build a threehundred- kilometer pipeline that will drain the delta; Ethiopia and Egypt, where population growth is threatening conflict along the Nile; and Bangladesh and India, where flooding in the Ganges caused by melting glaciers in the Himalayas is wreaking havoc in Bangladesh, leading to a rise in illegal, and unpopular, migration to India.

### Latin America

#### Credible rule of law promotion is modelled by Latin America and is key to stability

Cooper, 08 (James, Institute Professor of Law and an Assistant Dean at California Western School of Law, "COMPETING LEGAL CULTURES AND LEGAL REFORM: THE BATTLE OF CHILE," 29 Mich. J. Int'l L. 501, lexis)

The legal transplantation process involves, by its very nature, the adoption of, adaptation n57 to, incorporation of, or reference to legal cultures from abroad. n58 Judges, along with other actors in the legal [\*512] sector - including prosecutors, justice ministry officials, judicial councils, supreme courts, law school professors, ombudspeople, and public defenders - often look to rules, institutions, and jurisprudence from other countries, particularly to those from similar legal traditions and Anglo-Saxon or other legal cultures. n59 Professor Alan Watson contends that "legal transplants [are] the moving of a rule or a system of law from one country to another, or from one people or another since the earliest recorded history." n60 For many centuries, the legal codes and legal cultures that were established in Latin America were products of the colonial experience with Spain and Portugal. n61 Prior to independence, laws were merely imposed on the territories of the colonial powers. Spain, through the legal culture it transplanted during colonial times, enjoyed a consistent influence on the New World in the Americas. n62 In the colonies, "the Spanish judiciary was given almost no autonomy and continued to depend on the Crown's scholarly-inspired statutes with limited reflection of the principles, customs and values arising from Spain's diverse regions." n63 After independence in the early part of the nineteenth century, however, legal models from other countries like the United Kingdom and the United States soon found receptive homes in the southern parts of the Western Hemisphere. n64 Statutes, customs, and legal processes were [\*513] transplanted in a wholesale fashion, themselves the product of French influence over the codification process. n65 For much of the twentieth century - at least until the early 1980s - most governments in Latin America pursued policies of economic nationalism, including import substitution and controls on capital flows. Latin American governments closed markets to foreign competition and pursued state intervention. n66 When these policies failed, they resulted in economic stagnation, hyperinflation, and the erosion of living standards. n67 International bond defaults in the early 1980s produced military dictatorships and oppressive regimes simultaneously throughout Latin [\*514] America. The region was ready for a change. n68 In exchange for the adoption of certain rules and regulations concerning the functioning of markets, and some strengthening of democratic institutions, the international financial community lent money to these nascent democracies in an attempt to encourage a set of "neoliberal" policies - the so-called Washington Consensus. n69 Privatization of state assets was a central part of the prescription. n70 Deregulation, the opening of markets to foreign competition, and the lowering of barriers to trade were also recommended policies. n71 These policies - involving the flow of capital, intellectual property, technology, professional services, and ideas - require that disputes be settled fairly and by a set of recognized and enforced laws. n72 The rule of law, after all, provides the infrastructure upon which democracies may thrive, because it functions to enforce property rights and contracts. n73 [\*515] Likewise, the rule of law is the foundation for economic growth and prosperity: n74 Law is a key element of both a true and a stable democracy and of efficient economic interaction and development both domestically and internationally ... . The quality and availability of court services affect private investment decision and economic behavior at large, from domestic partnerships to foreign investment. n75 Foreign businesses that invest or do business abroad want to ensure that their intellectual property, shareholder, capital repatriation, contract, and real property rights will be protected. n76 It is not surprising, then, that in [\*516] the aftermath of the economic reforms, or at times concurrently, there also have been efforts to implement new criminal procedures, protect human and civil rights, and increase access to justice. n77 Economic growth and sustainable development require a functioning, transparent, and efficient judicial sector. n78 "It is not enough to build highways and factories to modernize a State ... a reliable justice system - the very basis of civilization - is needed as well." n79 Without the rule of law, corruption in the tendering regimes was rampant, encouraging the looting of national treasuries, n80 the exploitation of labor, and the polluting of the environment. n81 As Professor Joseph Stiglitz sadly points out, "The market [\*517] system requires clearly established property rights and the courts to enforce them; but often these are absent in developing countries." n82 A healthy and independent judicial power is also one third of a healthy democratic government. n83 Along with the executive and legislative branches, the judicial branch helps form the checks and balances to allow for an effective system of governance. Instead, what has resulted over the last few decades in many Latin American governments is a breakdown in the rule of law: a judiciary unable to change itself, virtual impunity from prosecution, judicial officers gunned down, and the wholesale interference with the independence of the judicial power. The judiciary is not as independent as the other two branches of government. n84 Instead, the judiciary functions as part of the civil service: devoid of law-making abilities, merely a slot machine for justice that applies the various codes. n85

#### Latin American instability goes global

Rochin 94 – Professor of Political Science

(James, Professor of Political Science at Okanagan University College, Discovering the Americas: the evolution of Canadian foreign policy towards Latin America, pp. 130-131)

While there were economic motivations for Canadian policy in Central America, security considerations were perhaps more important. Canada possessed an interest in promoting stability in the face of a potential decline of U.S. hegemony in the Americas. Perceptions of declining U.S. influence in the region – which had some credibility in 1979-1984 due to the wildly inequitable divisions of wealth in some U.S. client states in Latin America, in addition to political repression, under-development, mounting external debt, anti-American sentiment produced by decades of subjugation to U.S. strategic and economic interests, and so on – were linked to the prospect of explosive events occurring in the hemisphere. Hence, the Central American imbroglio was viewed as a fuse which could ignite a cataclysmic process throughout the region. Analysts at the time worried that in a worst-case scenario, instability created by a regional war, beginning in Central America and spreading elsewhere in Latin America, might preoccupy Washington to the extent that the United States would be unable to perform adequately its important hegemonic role in the international arena – a concern expressed by the director of research for Canada’s Standing Committee Report on Central America. It was feared that such a predicament could generate increased global instability and perhaps even a hegemonic war. This is one of the motivations which led Canada to become involved in efforts at regional conflict resolution, such as Contadora, as will be discussed in the next chapter.

## Politics

### AT Ag

#### Ag labor shortages are exaggerated

Martin 7 (Philip Martin, professor of agricultural and resource economics at the University of California, Davis, 07, Farm Labor Shortages: How Real? What Response? http://www.cis.org/articles/2007/back907.html)

News reports and editorials suggest widespread farm labor shortages. The Los Angeles Times described �a nationwide farm worker shortage threatening to leave fruits and vegetables rotting in fields.�1 The Wall Street Journal in a July 20, 2007, editorial claimed that �farmers nationwide are facing their most serious labor shortage in years.� The editorial asserted that �20 percent of American agricultural products were stranded at the farm gate� in 2006, including a third of North Carolina cucumbers, and predicted that crop losses in California would hit 30 percent in 2007. The Wall Street Journal editorial continued that, since �growers can only afford to pay so much and stay competitive,� some U.S. growers are moving fruit and vegetable production abroad. The New York Times profiled a southern California vegetable grower who rented land in Mexico to produce lettuce and broccoli because, the grower asserted: �I know beyond a shadow of a doubt that if I did that [raise U.S. wages] I would raise my costs and I would not have a legal work force.�2 These reports of farm labor shortages are not accompanied by data that would buttress the anecdotes, like lower production of fruits and vegetables or a rise in farm wages as growers scrambled for the fewer workers available. There is a simple reason. Fruit and vegetable production is rising, the average earnings of farm workers are not going up extraordinarily fast, and consumers are not feeling a pinch � the cost of fresh fruits and vegetables has averaged about $1 a day for most households over the past decade.

#### New tech and adaption solve food shortages

Michaels 11 Patrick Michaels is senior fellow in environmental studies at the CATO Institute. " Global Warming and Global Food Security," June 30, CATO, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/global-warming-global-food-security

While doing my dissertation I learned a few things about world crops. Serial adoption of new technologies produces a nearly constant increase in yields. Greater fertilizer application, improved response to fertilizer, better tractor technology, better tillage practices, old-fashioned genetic selection, and new-fashioned genetic engineering all conspire to raise yields, year after year.¶ Weather and climate have something to do with yields, too. Seasonal rainfall can vary a lot from year-to-year. That's "weather." If dry years become dry decades (that's "climate") farmers will switch from corn to grain sorghum, or, where possible, wheat. Breeders and scientists will continue to develop more water-efficient plants and agricultural technologies, such as no-till production.¶ Adaptation even applies to the home garden. The tomato variety "heat wave" sets fruit at higher temperatures than traditional cultivars.¶ However, Gillis claims that "[t]he rapid growth in farm output that defined the late 20th century has slowed" because of global warming.¶ His own figures show this is wrong. The increasing trend in world crop yields from 1960 to 1980 is exactly the same as from 1980 to 2010. And per capita grain production is rising, not falling.

### Uniqueness

#### Path to citizenship blocks passage -

Martinez 1/9/14 (Guillermo, South Florida, Sun Sentinel, "Guillermo Martinez: Congress Must Act Quickly for Immigration Reform")

Most moderate Republicans are in favor of passage of a law that would legalize the status of more than 11 million undocumented workers, and after strengthening security on the border, they are willing to consider a bill that would offer a path to citizenship.¶ These Republicans understand the party cannot continue to push aside the Hispanic vote. Hispanics are the fastest growing ethnic group in the country, and most consider opposition to passage of an immigration reform bill as a personal affront.¶ Still, the idea of including a path to citizenship, as it stands now in the version passed by the Senate, is mission impossible. It makes no difference if the path to citizenship would come only after a lengthy process — 13 years in the Senate bill — and after the border is secure.¶ Republicans simply are not willing to go that far.¶ If it is a path to citizenship, or nothing, then immigration reform will have to wait for a new Congress and possibly a new administration.

### PC Not Key

#### Capital not key

Gizzi 1/13/14 (John, Chief Political Columnist and White House Correspondent for Newsmax, "Why the GOP Doesn't Trust Obama on Immigration")

Republican House members are insisting on a "step-by-step" approach on immigration in lieu of the comprehensive package passed by the Senate because they don't trust President Obama, a leading GOP lawmaker told Newsmax.¶ California Rep. Jeff Denham said the GOP is determined to stop the president using executive orders to tamper with an immigration overhaul – like he did with Obamacare.¶ "There are two major issues involved in the ruling out of any comprehensive immigration plan, including that passed by the Senate," said Denham, whose Central California district has a population that is 40 percent Latino. ¶ "One is that we have a better border security plan, and that has to be implemented before we expand into other areas. The Senate bill bails on this."¶ The other major reason the Senate's immigration overhaul will never get through the House, Denham said, "is a lack of trust in this president. We have to make sure that any bills that become law cannot be subjected to any executive order by this president."

### Link Turn

#### Ending indefinite detention gives Obama PC for other battles

Klaidman 12/12 (Daniel, Congress Cooperates, Obama Pushes Hard, and Closing Gitmo Has a Chance<http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/12/12/congress-cooperates-obama-pushes-hard-and-closing-gitmo-has-a-chance.html>)

Are we closer to closing Guantanamo? It’s beginning to look that way. Earlier this week the Republican-led House and the Democratic-led Senate reached a compromise as part of an annual defense policy bill that would make it easier to transfer detainees from Guantanamo to foreign countries willing to take them. And while many in the press interpreted the news as evidence that [Gitmo](http://www.thedailybeast.com/witw/articles/2013/09/02/lifting-the-veil-with-souad-mekhennet-breaking-bread-with-a-former-guantanamo-prisoner-as-the-hunger-strike-wears-on.html)was here to stay, the bipartisan deal was actually a watershed moment in the long saga. It was the first time since Obama signed his original executive order that Congress moved to make it easier–not harder–to close the 12-year-old facility. “It’s as if the president finally decided to flip the on-switch and the White House and Defense Department got up and running to work towards closing Guantanamo,” says Christopher Anders, senior legislative counsel at the American Civil Liberties Union. “And it paid off, with a big Senate vote supporting easing some of the transfer restrictions.” There were many factors that led to this rare bit of tangible progress on Gitmo. Among them was a political climate that had been steadily shifting away from concerns about national security--especially as the country absorbs the reality that U.S. forces will be largely out of Afghanistan by year’s end. Meanwhile, Washington has been preoccupied with all-consuming battles over debt ceilings and sequestration. And in a time of austerity, arguments about the high cost of maintaining the controversial prison started to gain considerable traction with moderate Democrats and even some Republicans. But it is also the case that the Guantanamo stalemate began to give way to progress because of a resolute push by Obama as well as a willingness to spend political capital that was not always present during the president’s first term. Obama drove his advisers hard and pushed them to regularly update him on progress. And crucially, he made sure that his team engaged Congress, both to win the cooperation of lawmakers but also to signal that closing Guantanamo was one of the highest priorities of his second term.

#### Winners win on detention issues

Klaidman 12/12 (Daniel, Congress Cooperates, Obama Pushes Hard, and Closing Gitmo Has a Chance<http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/12/12/congress-cooperates-obama-pushes-hard-and-closing-gitmo-has-a-chance.html>)

The real test of Obama’s legislative muscle came in the fall when Republican Senator Kelly Ayotte tried to kill the Levin language with an amendment that would have kept all of the Gitmo restrictions in place. Monaco and White House lobbyists continued to work the phones, while the White House organized a barrage of letters to the Hill from top national security officials, including Hagel, Kerry, and Attorney General Eric Holder Jr. Meanwhile Obama continued to signal that the initiative was a presidential priority. On November 4 he met with both of his Gitmo envoys. During the meeting, according to a source who was present, Obama told Sloan and Lewis that he was prepared to do whatever they needed to help them succeed in their mission–whatever “blocking and tackling” that was necessary, as Obama put it. But in some ways it was the visual image of the meeting that was most important. The White House released a picture of Obama with his envoys, and National Security Council spokesperson Caitlin Hayden tweeted out news of the meeting. The lobbying offensive lasted right up until the vote. On November 19, the White House was able to beat back the Ayotte amendment. Crucially they won three Republicans to their side, including McCain, whose position wasn’t known until shortly before the vote. McCain told colleagues that he had been in discussions with the highest levels of the White House, which colleagues interpreted to mean Obama himself, according to one Senate staffer. For his part, Graham didn’t take to the Senate floor to attack the administration’s position, as he had on other occasions. Having McCain on board gave Senate Democrats momentum going into negotiations with the House earlier this month. And while supporters of the prison’s closure hardly got everything they wanted (the ban on transferring detainees to the U.S was maintained) the administration now has a freer hand to start emptying out the facility. For a president who believes in playing the long game, this was an inflection point. “Momentum begets momentum,” one of Obama’s senior advisers observes, savoring the rarest of things for this White House: a victory on Guantanamo.

#### Ending detention is popular- new cost-concerns are a game-changer

Kaper, 12-23 -- National Journal staff

[Stacy, "Obama, Congress Bring Guantanamo Bay Prison Closer to Closed," National Journal, 12-23-13, www.nationaljournal.com/defense/obama-congress-bring-guantanamo-bay-prison-closer-to-closed-20131223, accessed 1-3-14]

Startling revelations have **built momentum** for closing the controversial detention facility—including among defense hawks. More important, perhaps, is a provision tucked into the latest National Defense Authorization Act that lifts transfer restrictions on detainees who have been cleared to leave and were never charged for a crime. The new rules allow them to return to their home countries or to certain other nations willing to receive them. The ease in policy clears a path for 79 detainees—half of the facility's remaining population—to leave under monitoring or other arrangements with their new host country. And many among the other half of the remaining population are under review, which could lead to additional transfers. So what breathed new life into previously floundering efforts to close the facility? In short: Dollars and cents. At the behest of lawmakers, the Pentagon released new data this summer on the costs of Guantanamo Bay—and the totals far exceeded previous estimates. The U.S. has spent $5 billion on Guantanamo Bay since it started accepting prisoners in 2002. Right now, the facility costs the federal government an average of $2.7 million per prisoner per year In a sequestered spending environment, that price tag is a **red flag** for those looking to conserve resources for defense programs deemed more vital. Those cost concerns are changing the battle lines of the decade-old argument over the facility. Previously, closing Guantanamo was seen as an argument between defense hawks and civil libertarians. Obama and his allies argued that the base—where neither the U.S. Constitution nor Cuban law applies—falls short of the standards of American society. Those arguments carried only limited currency in Congress, particularly among defense hawks. But now that proponents of closing Gitmo can point both to ideological concerns and arguments that it's taking up funds that would be better spent elsewhere, many in Congress think the facility's days are numbered. "The change in policy is significant," said Rep. Adam Schiff, D-Calif. "What it reflects is that we are past the high-water mark of support for Guantanamo and that support in Congress is on the decline.… It's indicative of momentum to close the prison, but it is also an indication of how far we have yet to go."

#### Only a risk of a link turn- Obama’s spent PC on Gitmo for months

Klaidman 12/12 (Daniel, Congress Cooperates, Obama Pushes Hard, and Closing Gitmo Has a Chance<http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/12/12/congress-cooperates-obama-pushes-hard-and-closing-gitmo-has-a-chance.html>)

But it wasn’t until last spring that Obama’s desire to redouble his efforts became public, forced to the surface by hunger-striking prisoners. A few weeks later Obama fleshed out his ideas for closing Guantanamo in a major national security speech at the National Defense University in Washington. During the speech Obama announced some unilateral actions he would take, such as lifting the ban he had imposed on transferring dozens of Yemeni detainees who’d been cleared for transfer back to their insurgency-wracked country. But what he could not answer was how he would break the political logjam in Congress. He had no obvious solution for persuading Republicans to lift the series of onerous restrictions they had placed on the administration’s ability to transfer detainees out of Gitmo. The answer to that question was more ineffable; it was about presidential leadership–the power of persuasion–and, ultimately, Obama’s own will to act. Within his own administration, Obama had to jump-start a policy that had effectively ground to a halt in 2011. In meetings he exhorted his advisers to move expeditiously, telling them that he didn’t want a single prisoner left in the offshore prison by the time he left office. And while he acknowledged that it would impossible to empty Gitmo in the face of the congressional restrictions, he insisted that that could not be an excuse for inaction. Obama imposed a system of accountability within his administration to ensure that the policy didn’t drift, as it had during his first term. He began a search for Gitmo special envoys at both the State Department and the Pentagon, senior officials who would “wake up everyday asking themselves” how they had advanced the cause of closing the prison, as a senior adviser to Obama puts it. The president required Secretary of State John Kerry and Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel to give him weekly progress reports on the effort. And he placed the broad initiative under the direction of Lisa Monaco, the White House counterterrorism and homeland security adviser. One of the first things he directed Monaco to do was develop a timeline of goals and objectives that he could measure progress against.

### Thumper

#### Laundry list thumps- elections, trade, budget, energy and Podesta nomination

Peckingpaugh et al. 1/16 (Tim L. Peckinpaugh (Partner of K&L Law Firm- focus on Energy), Darrell L. Conner (Government Affairs Counselor), Sean P. McGlynn (Government Affairs Analyst), “2014 Legislative & Regulatory Outlook”, <http://www.klgates.com/2014-legislative--regulatory-outlook-01-16-2014/>, January 16, 2014)

As this memo makes clear, the combined factors of the 2013 budget deal, the recent Senate rules changes, and the appointment of John Podesta would seem to increase the likelihood for both legislative and regulatory action even during an election year. While it’s certainly reasonable to expect that legislative and regulatory action may begin to slow as Congress gets closer to the election in November, it’s important to engage lawmakers and regulators early in 2014 to ensure that you are influencing the policymaking process when it matters most and before it is too far developed. And remember, there is always the possibility – if not an almost certainty – that a lame duck session will occur to complete Congressional work in 2014.

# 1AR

## Anthro

### -- AT: Ethics

#### Ethics are impossible without distinguishing between humans and animals

**Schulman, 1995** J. Neil, the illogic of animal rights, http://www.pulpless.com/jneil/aniright.html

If human beings are no different from other animals, then like all other animals it is our nature to kill any other animal which serves the purposes of our survival and well-being, for that is the way of all nature. Therefore, aside from economic concerns such as making sure we don't kill so quickly that we destroy a species and deprive our descendants of prey, human animals can kill members of other animal species for their usefulness to us.

It is only if we are not just another animal -- if our nature is distinctly superior to other animals -- that we become subject to ethics at all -- and then those ethics must take into account our nature as masters of the lower animals. We may seek a balance of nature; but "balance" is a concept that only a species as intelligent as humankind could even contemplate. We may choose to temper the purposes to which we put lower animals with empathy and wisdom; but by virtue of our superior nature, we decide ... and if those decisions include the consumption of animals for human utilitarian or recreational purposes, then the limits on the uses we put the lower beasts are ones we set according to our individual human consciences. "Animal rights" do not exist in either case.

### Bestiality

#### Breaking down divisions between human and animal makes bestiality acceptable

**Carnell, 01** Brian, Peter Singer Offers Moral Justification for Bestiality, <http://www.animalrights.net/articles/2001/000040.html> google cache

One of the major underpinnings of much animal rights thought is the notion of speciesism -- this is the claim, advanced by animal rights philosophers such as [Peter Singer](http://www.animalrights.net/archives/related_topics/people/pro_ar/s/peter_singer.html), that there is no rational basis for commonly held moral distinctions between human beings and non-human animals. Singer, and many others in the animal rights movement, maintain that the impetus behind such distinctions is based on an irrational attachment to the importance of human beings above all other species, which is deplorable in much the same way that arguing in favor of special moral distinctions for whites vs. non-whites or men vs. women is deplorable.

Critics of such views have maintained that not only is speciesism morally justifiable in ways that racism or sexism are not, but that animal rights advocates do not apply the concept of speciesism in ways that are internally consistent. In fact, most animal rights activists seem to veer away from the genuinely radical implications of speciesism.

But not Singer. In an article published in the online magazine, Nerve, the philosophertakes the speciesism idea to its logical extreme and argues that there is no rational reason to deplore sexual relations between human beings and non-human animals. The condemnation of inter-species sexuality, according to Singer, is just another example of a speciesist distinction.

#### All bestiality is rape and fosters violence towards animals and women.

**Adams**, 19**95** Carol, Feminist Author, http://www.pet-abuse.com/pages/animal\_cruelty/bestiality.php

The notion of bestiality as a safety valve that operates until the (usually young) men are ready for women leads one to ask whether the women to whom these young men graduate are not safety valves, too. Moreover, this form of bestiality is not a harmless aberration. Animals are harmed in safety-valve bestiality, and humans learn that it is okay to treat others as safety valves. In the second kind of bestiality, fixated sex, an animal becomes the exclusive focus of a human's sexual desires. Although many medical terms have been applied to a fixation on sex with animals, those who engage in this kind of sex prefer to be known as "zoophiles," a word borrowed, ironically, from the animal protection community. The zoophile's worldview is similar to the rapist's and child sexual abuser's. They all view the sex they have with their victims as consensual, and they believe it benefits their sexual "partners" as well as themselves.

Just as pedophiles differentiate between those who abuse children and those who love children—placing themselves, of course, in the latter group—zoophiles distinguish between animal sexual abusers (bestialists) and those who love animals (zoophiles). In each of these cases the distinctions are only self-justifications.