# Note

#### I don’t have all of the 1NR docs. They should be uploaded later

# Round 1 v Emporia CW

## 1NC

### 1

#### Our interpretation is that the ballot is to determine if the enactment of a topical plan is better than the status quo or a competitive advocacy

#### Violation:

#### A) “Resolved” implies a policy or legislative decision – means they must be resolved about a future federal government policy

Jeff Parcher, former debate coach at Georgetown, Feb 2001 http://www.ndtceda.com/archives/200102/0790.html

Pardon me if I turn to a source besides Bill. American Heritage Dictionary: Resolve: 1. To make a firm decision about. 2. To decide or express by formal vote. 3. To separate something into constiutent parts See Syns at \*analyze\* (emphasis in orginal) 4. Find a solution to. See Syns at \*Solve\* (emphasis in original) 5. To dispel: resolve a doubt. - n 1. Firmness of purpose; resolution. 2. A determination or decision. (2) The very nature of the word "resolution" makes it a question. American Heritage: A course of action determined or decided on. A formal statement of a decision, as by a legislature. (3) The resolution is obviously a question. Any other conclusion is utterly inconceivable. Why? Context. The debate community empowers a topic committee to write a topic for ALTERNATE side debating. The committee is not a random group of people coming together to "reserve" themselves about some issue. There is context - they are empowered by a community to do something. In their deliberations, the topic community attempts to craft a resolution which can be ANSWERED in either direction. They focus on issues like ground and fairness because they know the resolution will serve as the basis for debate which will be resolved by determining the policy desirablility of that resolution. That's not only what they do, but it's what we REQUIRE them to do. We don't just send the topic committee somewhere to adopt their own group resolution. It's not the end point of a resolution adopted by a body - it's the preliminary wording of a resolution sent to others to be answered or decided upon. (4) Further context: the word resolved is used to emphasis the fact that it's policy debate. Resolved comes from the adoption of resolutions by legislative bodies. A resolution is either adopted or it is not. It's a question before a legislative body. Should this statement be adopted or not. (5) The very terms 'affirmative' and 'negative' support my view. One affirms a resolution.

#### B) USFG is the national government in DC.

Encarta Online Encyclopedia, 2k

(http://encarta.msn.com)

“The federal government **of the U**nited **S**tates **is centered in** Washington **DC”**

#### C) Should means there is a practical reason for action

WordNet in ‘97

Princeton University, 1.6

**Should** v 1 : be expected to: “Parties should be fun” 2 : **expresses an** emotional**, practical,** or other **reason for doing something:** “You had better put on warm clothes”; “You should call your mother-in-law”; *“The State ought to repair bridges*”[syn**:** had better, ought]

#### Defending the federal government in the context of the resolution is crucial to prepared debate and clash that leads to energetic debates on both sides.

#### First, there are multiple ways they could engage the state.

#### a. Eliminating restrictions on brownfields provides an avenue to discuss structural racism inherent in energy production

Kibel 98

(Paul Stanton, LLM @ Cal-Berkeley “The urban nexus: Open space, Brownfields, and justice,” Boston College Environmental Affairs Law Review 25. 3, Proquest)

Although it is not too difficult a task to describe the reality of urban decline, it is another task altogether to identify and isolate the underlying trigger of this decline. Many different culprits have been proposed, including racism, capitalism, environmental extremism, postindustrialism, technology, drugs, the media, the automobile, the police, the public school system, too much government regulation, and too little government regulation. Is one of the these issues or entities the true cause? Is there a precise cause and effect explanation for why our cities are now subject to such powerful and destructive economic, environmental, and racial pressures?¶ These are important questions, but questions that I will not try to answer in this Essay. Regardless of whether there initially was an underlying trigger, we have reached a point where the various components of urban decline are now feeding on and reinforcing each other.9 They are all interconnected contributors to the downward spiral that has left our urban cores in their current condition.lo Therefore, instead of arguing for or against a particular underlying cause, this Essay will focus on the relation among certain critical components of the urban decline cycle. More specifically, I will assess three particular components: (1) the impact of suburban sprawl and open space conversion on the urban economy and the environment; (2) the impact of environmental hazardous waste liability on the development of urban neighborhoods and the urban economy; and (3) the impact of suburban sprawl and environmental hazardous waste liability on the health conditions and economic welfare of poor, primarily minority, communities living in the urban core. Although my analysis will draw extensively on the experience in the San Francisco Bay Area, this Essay is not city-specific. The Essay addresses issues that are affecting virtually every major U.S. metropolitan area.¶ To be certain, open space loss, abandoned brownfields, and economic inequity are not the only components of the urban decline cycle. However, they are three areas in which existing law, especially in terms of land-use zoning and environmental liability, has played a crucial role. They therefore are also areas where legal reform potentially can play a crucial role in reversing the pattern of urban decline. By providing a useful framework in which to evaluate such reform, this Essay should assist lawyers and other citizens who are working to reclaim our cities as beautiful, vibrant, and just communities.

#### b. Environmental justice affs are possible through the discussion of legislative incentives

Bullard 08

(Robert D. Bullard, Ph.D, Environmental Justice Resource Center,Clark Atlanta University, 7/2/08, “Poverty, Pollution, and Environmental Racism: Strategies for Building Healthy and Sustainable Communities,” <http://www.ejrc.cau.edu/PovpolEj.html>)

The environmental justice movement emerged in response to environmental inequities, threats to public health, unequal protection, differential enforcement, and disparate treatment received by the poor and people of color. Poverty and environmental degradation are intricately linked and take a heavy toll on billions of people in developing and industrialized countries alike. Thus, any search for sustainable development must address the root causes of both poverty and pollution and seek solutions to this double threat. Redefinition of Environmental Protection. The environmental justice movement redefined environmental protection as a basic right. It also emphasized pollution prevention, waste minimization, and cleaner production techniques as strategies to achieve environmental justice for all without regard to race, color, national origin, or income. Many countries have environmental and human laws to protect the health and welfare of its citizens-including racial and ethnic groups and indigenous peoples. However, all communities have not received the same benefits from their application, implementation, and enforcement. Design a Holistic Approach to Environmental Protection. The environmental justice movement has set out clear goals of eliminating unequal enforcement of environmental, civil rights, and public health laws, differential exposure of some populations to harmful chemicals, pesticides, and other toxins in the home, school, neighborhood, and workplace, faulty assumptions in calculating, assessing, and managing risks, discriminatory zoning and land-use practices, and exclusionary policies and practices that limit some individuals and groups from participation in decision making. Many of these problems could be eliminated if existing environmental, health, housing, and civil rights laws were vigorously enforced in a nondiscriminatory way. Clean and Affordable Energy. Governments should initiate an action program to make available finances and infrastructure to bring clean and affordable and sustainable energy sources to the 2 billion people who lack these energy service by 2012. Governments should adopt a target increasing the global share of new renewable energy sources to 15% by 2010. Decrease Pesticide Use. Institute protocols and plan to decrease pesticide use, including prohibiting the export of banned or never registered pesticides, implement integrated pest management (IPM), evaluate the hazards posed by pesticide exports, and improve the quality and quantity of information pesticide production, trade and use and publish information in the public record. Reduce Children's Exposure to Neurotoxicants. Abate lead in older housing; complete phase out leaded gasoline; target high-risk children, screening, early detection, treatment; increase allocation of medications that help reduce or remove lead; use new, safe lead removal techniques; and dietary improvements. Strengthen Legislation and Regulations. A legislative approach may be needed where environmental, health, and worker safety laws and regulations are weak or nonexistent. However, laws and regulations are only as good as their enforcement. Unequal political power arrangements also have allowed poisons of the rich to be offered as short term economic remedies for poverty.

#### AND Our standard for a topical aff is that it shouldn’t be unbeatable but rather one that allows an equitable division of ground to allow debate on both sides.

#### AND They will say that we exclude people who don’t like the state but that is an overgeneralization from defending the state in every instance to defending the state about this particular resolution.

#### Second, education about the state is crucial to activism.

#### a. Arguing about what governments *ought* to do is not the same as complicity with the existing order

Dower 10

(Nigel, Senior Lecturer in Philosophy at the University of Aberdeen, Scotland, former President of the International Development Ethics Association “Questioning the Questioning of Cosmopolitanism,” in Questioning Cosmopolitanism, p. 14)

Ethical cosmopolitanism does not merely apply to individuals; it is also applied to the state system and to international relations. It is one of three main approaches generally recognized – the other two being realism or international skepticism, and internationalism or the morality of states approach – but we may want to add, as Simon Caney argues, a distinct fourth approach called nationalism.30 Whether or not a cosmopolitan argues for new forms of global governance – we come to that issue later – the cosmopolitan at least wishes to assess how well or badly nation- states and the international system deliver on the goals that the cosmopolitan accepts or advocates. As such the cosmopolitan will tend to advocate better and larger aid programs, more open and generous immigration and refugee policies, stronger mea- sures to deal with environmental problems, reductions in armaments together with the general promotion of peace anywhere, concern about human rights violations elsewhere and appropriate responses to them, and so on. Critics will argue that such an approach is idealistic, inappropriate or dangerous. National governments are not merely entitled but also have a duty to protect and pro- mote the national interest, whether this has to do with strong defenses in an insecure world or protecting the country’s economic interests. The duty of governments is that of trustees and is justified through various kinds of political theory. Particularly in democracies, governments have a duty to do broadly what their electorates expect them to do and that is to protect and promote the interests of their electorates. The duties of governments are also partly to be understood in terms of the commit- ments their countries have made to other countries in the international arena. Pacta sunt servanda is a well-accepted principle: agreements, whether bilateral or through international law, do create a framework of obligation although this framework has nothing to do with cosmopolitan assumptions. So what the cosmopolitan advocates, if it goes beyond these two types of duty, is inappropriate. It is also dangerous, as realists like E. H. Carr argue, because on the whole the world is a more dangerous and unstable place if countries promote ethical agendas in other parts of the world rather than stick to protecting their vital national interests.31 But these considerations do not undermine a cosmopolitan approach to interna- tional relations. What they do is complicate the ethical analysis that is needed. If a cosmopolitan, as most nowadays do, advocates democratic values, then she will welcome, other things being equal, governments being genuinely responsive to the democratic will. If a cosmopolitan accepts the value of promise-keeping and the value of peace and stability that comes from a well functioning international order, then she will welcome, other things being equal, the observance of international agreements and laws. Indeed, if commitments such as those to do with alleviat- ing world poverty (for instance, the 0.7% GNP commitment in the 1970s and the Millennium Development Goals of 2000) were properly honored, and if commit- ments to environmental law and to human rights protection were properly carried out, many of the goals which cosmopolitans hold dear would be much more realized than they generally are in current circumstances. But this does not prevent the cosmopolitan from advocating that more should be done or that things should be done differently. There is no more paradox involved here than what is standardly accepted in regard to democracy. In one sense govern- ments ought to do what their electorates mandate, but this does not prevent each citizen advocating policies for governments which are different from what is man- dated. Indeed, if we were unable to have views about what governments ought to do other than that they ought to carry out the democratic will, the democratic will would be groundless! What the democratic argument shows is that if a cosmopolitan wants his views to be implemented by governments, then the crucial task is that of persuading sufficient numbers of citizens of his views, and preparing the next gen- eration through cosmopolitan education. As for realist arguments like Carr’s, the cosmopolitan does indeed have reason to be cautious about advocating policies that would undermine peace and order. But in fact Carr’s strictures are more directed at the kind of proselytizing cosmopolitanism we considered earlier than one focused on creating the conditions for the general realization of human well-being.

#### b. Its key to motivate legislative fence-sitters. Their critical approach endangers public and decision-making backlashes which turn the case.

Brown 11

[heath, PhD Political Science, Roanoke, Salem, VA, “narrative strategies used by interest groups during the 2008 presidental transition”, 2011 Pat-Net Conference]

Milbrath argues that interest groups must strategically present information so as to ¶ overcome the “perceptual screen” that shields policy makers from absorbing endless amounts ¶ of information. He suggests that groups use facts (scientific information about policy ¶ outcomes), arguments (normative explanations of justness or rightness of action), and power¶ (typically subtle offers of political support or threats of political retribution) to communicate ¶ their interests and make their case for policy action (or inaction). In a more recent approach, ¶ Esterling (2007, p. 79) makes the case that groups can use [using] “instrumental” – “research or ¶ evidence-based causal” arguments -- or “normative” – “intrinsic desirability” arguments. By ¶ emphasizing one of these approaches, a group is tacitly communicating the way it wants to ¶ persuade the target of the information. By emphasizing power or normative arguments, the ¶ group implies that the policy maker should make decisions based primarily on their political ¶ judgment and political future. Conversely, by emphasizing facts-based or instrumental ¶ arguments, the group implies that the policy maker should base decisions primarily on rational ¶ or scientific considerations. In practice, it is difficult to disentangle these two types of ¶ arguments and many groups will likely combine various ways to present information (Wright ¶ 1996; Rochefort and Cobb 1994). The dichotomy though does help clarify the persuasive or ¶ argumentative tone of the information and advice given by groups to policy makers. 6 ¶ While public perceptions of interest groups might suggest crass self-interest, ¶ manipulation, and deception, groups have an incentive to be forthright in the information they ¶ provide and arguments they make. A group that provides shoddy statistics or misleading ¶ arguments will be discounted in future interactions with the policy maker (Kersh 2009; ¶ Easterling 2007). John E. Chubb (1983, p. 145) writes in regard to energy interest groups: ¶ “information and advice that are solely self-serving threaten the bond of trust that facilitates ¶ the informal play of influence.” In fact, rather than targeting political opponents or fence ¶ sitters, much research suggests that groups prefer or are invited to lobby friends and allies over ¶ adversaries (Baumgartner et al. 2009; Hojnacki and Kimball 1998, 1999; Hall and Deardorff ¶ 2006; Bauer et al. 1963; Holyoke 2004; McCool 1990). If this is the case, the cost of ¶ misrepresenting or overstating information may be particularly high for those engaged in what ¶ Hall and Deardorff (2006) and others have called “legislative subsidy” (Hall and Deardorff 2006; ¶ Esterling 2007a). From this subsidy perspective, if a policy maker is sub-contracting information ¶ collection and analysis to an allied interest group, it behooves that group to be conscientious, ¶ thorough, and consistent in the information and advice it gives. And in many cases, as Wright ¶ (1996) contends, it is relatively easy for policy makers to check the authenticity of the ¶ information provided to them, sometimes simply through the contradictory information ¶ provided by other groups, thereby curtailing the inclination to blatantly misrepresent the truth. ¶ Furthermore, experimental research shows that factual or instrumental information is ¶ preferred by legislative staff (LaPira 2008) and neutral expert lobbyists have more legislative ¶ access than non-experts (Esterling 2007b). Facts may be useful on their own terms in ¶ formulating legislative decisions but scientific or statistically based arguments also serve as a 7 ¶ cue for policy makers to determine the credibility or reliability of the advice they are given ¶ (Sabatier 1978). ¶ Rather than convince those already in agreement, the approach taken by proactive ¶ theorists suggests that groups seek to convince legislative fence sitters or opponents to adopt ¶ the group’s position, advocate the group’s interests, or simply vote in the group’s way through ¶ the offer of, or refusal to give, political support (Smith 1984; Austen-Smith and Wright 1994; ¶ Wright 1996). Wright (1990) for one finds that groups which distribute campaign contributions ¶ to a wide group of legislators are then able to access a wider group, rather than just political ¶ allies (Wright 1990). Similarly, Heberling (2005) shows that one group, the AFL-CIO, seeks out ¶ legislators with unknown political preferences rather than targeting political allies (Heberling ¶ 2005). The field of interest group research has not yet resolved whether groups typically lobby ¶ friends, adversaries, or some combination of the two (Leech and Baumgartner 1998). This is ¶ likely due to the wide variation of group types and also policy domains in which groups operate. ¶ These inter-organizational and inter-policy differences affect the strategies employed and ¶ therefore the content of information presented during lobbying.

#### c. Focus on state based pedagogy is key to combat racism.

Themba-Nixon 2k

Makani, Exec Director of the Praxis Project Colorlines, Changing the Rules: What Public Policy Means for Organizing  [Jul 31, 2000](http://proquest.umi.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/pqdweb?RQT=572&VType=PQD&VName=PQD&VInst=PROD&pmid=58714&pcid=8092111&SrchMode=3&aid=1). Vol. 3, Iss. 2; pg. 12, proquest

"This is all about policy," a woman complained to me in a recent conversation. "I'm an organizer." The flourish and passion with which she made the distinction said everything. Policy is for wonks, sell-out politicians, and ivory-tower eggheads. Organizing is what real, grassroots people do. Common as it may be, this distinction doesn't bear out in the real world. Policy is more than law. It is any written agreement (formal or informal) that specifies how an institution, governing body, or community will address shared problems or attain shared goals. It spells out the terms and the consequences of these agreements and is the codification of the body's values-as represented by those present in the policymaking process. Given who's usually present, most policies reflect the political agenda of powerful elites. Yet, policy can be a force for change-especially when we bring our base and community organizing into the process. In essence, policies are the codification of power relationships and resource allocation. Policies are the rules of the world we live in. Changing the world means changing the rules. So, if organizing is about changing the rules and building power, how can organizing be separated from policies? Can we really speak truth to power, fight the right, stop corporate abuses, or win racial justice without contesting the rules and the rulers, the policies and the policymakers? The answer is no-and double no for people of color. Today, racism subtly dominates nearly every aspect of policymaking. From ballot propositions to city funding priorities, policy is increasingly about the control, de-funding, and disfranchisement of communities of color. What Do We Stand For? Take the public conversation about welfare reform, for example. Most of us know it isn't really about putting people to work. The right's message was framed around racial stereotypes of lazy, cheating "welfare queens" whose poverty was "cultural." But the new welfare policy was about moving billions of dollars in individual cash payments and direct services from welfare recipients to other, more powerful, social actors. Many of us were too busy to tune into the welfare policy drama in Washington, only to find it washed up right on our doorsteps. Our members are suffering from workfare policies, new regulations, and cutoffs. Families who were barely getting by under the old rules are being pushed over the edge by the new policies. Policy doesn't get more relevant than this. And so we got involved in policy-as defense. Yet we have to do more than block their punches. We have to start the fight with initiatives of our own. Those who do are finding offense a bit more fun than defense alone. Living wage ordinances, youth development initiatives, even gun control and alcohol and tobacco policies are finding their way onto the public agenda, thanks to focused community organizing that leverages power for community-driven initiatives. - Over 600 local policies have been passed to regulate the tobacco industry. Local coalitions have taken the lead by writing ordinances that address local problems and organizing broad support for them. - Nearly 100 gun control and violence prevention policies have been enacted since 1991. - Milwaukee, Boston, and Oakland are among the cities that have passed living wage ordinances: local laws that guarantee higher than minimum wages for workers, usually set as the minimum needed to keep a family of four above poverty. These are just a few of the examples that demonstrate how organizing for local policy advocacy has made inroads in areas where positive national policy had been stalled by conservatives. Increasingly, the local policy arena is where the action is and where activists are finding success. Of course, corporate interests-which are usually the target of these policies-are gearing up in defense. Tactics include front groups, economic pressure, and the tried and true: cold, hard cash. Despite these barriers, grassroots organizing can be very effective at the smaller scale of local politics. At the local level, we have greater access to elected officials and officials have a greater reliance on their constituents for reelection. For example, getting 400 people to show up at city hall in just about any city in the U.S. is quite impressive. On the other hand, 400 people at the state house or the Congress would have a less significant impact. Add to that the fact that all 400 people at city hall are usually constituents, and the impact is even greater. Recent trends in government underscore the importance of local policy. Congress has enacted a series of measures devolving significant power to state and local government. Welfare, health care, and the regulation of food and drinking water safety are among the areas where states and localities now have greater rule. Devolution has some negative consequences to be sure. History has taught us that, for social services and civil rights in particular, the lack of clear federal standards and mechanisms for accountability lead to uneven enforcement and even discriminatory implementation of policies. Still, there are real opportunities for advancing progressive initiatives in this more localized environment. Greater local control can mean greater community power to shape and implement important social policies that were heretofore out of reach. To do so will require careful attention to the mechanics of local policymaking and a clear blueprint of what we stand for. Getting It in Writing Much of the work of framing what we stand for takes place in the shaping of demands. By getting into the policy arena in a proactive manner, we can take our demands to the next level. Our demands can become law, with real consequences if the agreement is broken. After all the organizing, press work, and effort, a group should leave a decisionmaker with more than a handshake and his or her word. Of course, this work requires a certain amount of interaction with "the suits," as well as struggles with the bureaucracy, the technical language, and the all-too-common resistance by decisionmakers. Still, if it's worth demanding, it's worth having in writing-whether as law, regulation, or internal policy. From ballot initiatives on rent control to laws requiring worker protections, organizers are leveraging their power into written policies that are making a real difference in their communities. Of course, policy work is just one tool in our organizing arsenal, but it is a tool we simply can't afford to ignore. Making policy work an integral part of organizing will require a certain amount of retrofitting. We will need to develop the capacity to translate our information, data, and experience into stories that are designed to affect the public conversation. Perhaps most important, we will need to move beyond fighting problems and on to framing solutions that bring us closer to our vision of how things should be. And then we must be committed to making it so.

#### d. Understanding the intersections of social dilemmas is key to democratic reform of racial hierarchies

Winant 2k

(Howard, Temple University “Race and Race Theory” Annual Review of Sociology, 2000, http://www.soc.ucsb.edu/faculty/winant/Race\_and\_Race\_Theory.html)

To summarize the racial formation approach: (1) It views the meaning of race and the content of racial identities as unstable and politically contested; (2) It understands racial formation as the intersection/conflict of racial "projects" that combine representational/discursive elements with structural/institutional ones; (3) It sees these intersections as iterative sequences of interpretations ("articulations") of the meaning of race that are open to many types of agency, from the individual to the organizational, from the local to the global. If we are to understand the changing significance of race at the end of the 20th century, we must develop a more effective theory of race. The racial formation perspective at least suggests some directions in which such a theory should be pursued. As in the past, racial theory today is shaped by the large-scale sociopolitical processes it is called upon to explain. Employing a racial formation perspective, it is possible to glimpse a pattern in present global racial dynamics. That pattern looks something like the following: in the period during and after WWII an enormous challenge was posed to established systems of rule by racially-defined social movements around the world. Although these movement challenges achieved some great gains and precipitated important reforms in state racial policy, neither the movements nor the reforms could be consolidated. At the end of the century the world as a whole, and various national societies as well, are far from overcoming the tenacious legacies of colonial rule, apartheid, and segregation. All still experience continuing confusion, anxiety, and contention about race. Yet the legacies of epochal struggles for freedom, democracy, and human rights persist as well. Despite the enormous vicissitudes that demarcate and distinguish national conditions, historical developments, roles in the international market, political tendencies, and cultural norms, racial differences often operate as they did in centuries past: as a way of restricting the political influence, not just of racially subordinated groups, but of all those at the bottom end of the system of social stratification. In the contemporary era, racial beliefs and practices have become far more contradictory and complex. The "old world racial order" has not disappeared, but it has been seriously disrupted and changed. The legacy of democratic, racially oriented movements, and anti-colonialist initiatives throughout the world's South, remains a force to be reckoned with. But the incorporative (or if one prefers this term, "hegemonic") effects of decades of reform-oriented state racial policies have had a profound effect as well: they have removed much of the motivation for sustained, anti-racist mobilization. In this unresolved situation, it is unlikely that attempts to address worldwide dilemmas of race and racism by ignoring or "transcending" these themes, for example by adopting so-called "colorblind" or "differentialist" policies, will have much effect. In the past the centrality of race deeply determined the economic, political, and cultural configuration of the modern world. Although recent decades have seen a tremendous efflorescence of movements for racial equality and justice, the legacies of centuries of racial oppression have not been overcome. Nor is a vision of racial justice fully worked out. Certainly the idea that such justice has already been largely achieved -- as seen in the "colorblind" paradigm in the US, the "non-racialist" rhetoric of the South African Freedom Charter, the Brazilian rhetoric of "racial democracy," or the emerging "racial differentialism" of the European Union -- remains problematic. Will race ever be "transcended"? Will the world ever "get beyond" race? Probably not. But the entire world still has a chance of overcoming the stratification, the hierarchy, the taken-for-granted injustice and inhumanity that so often accompanies the "race concept." Like religion or language, race can be accepted as part of the spectrum of the human condition, while it is simultaneously and categorically resisted as a means of stratifying national or global societies. Nothing is more essential in the effort to reinforce democratic commitments, not to mention global survival and prosperity, as we enter a new millennium.

#### e. Addressing problems created by political institutions is the best way to challenge whiteness

Bush 11

(Melanie, Associate Professor and Chair, Anthropology & Sociology @ Adelphi University, Everyday Forms of Whiteness: Understanding Race in a “Post-Racial” World, p. 235-236)

Carol Geary Schneider, president of the Association of American Colleges and Universities, has been quoted as saying, "Very few courses in the contemporary undergraduate curriculum directly address democratic principles and/or aspirations" (Schneider 1999, 9). She further asked where in the curriculum are students engaged about concepts of justice, democracy, equality, opportunity, and liberty and suggested that these challenging topics belong in general education because they are integral dimensions of American pluralism and must be understood in the context of their historical connections(Schneider 1999, 9). This engagement is central to the development of civic responsibility and social awareness as a core tenet of higher education. While most of the work on civic engagement does not speak to the issues of involvement in political projects or the world of social movements, the history of democracy in the United States alone and certainly globally is one that situates these activities squarely within the realm of liberal education and civic engagement. This may be avoided out of concern for partisanship, because of a perception that service is good, activism is problematic or is a result of efforts to sustain the status quo. Regardless of the reason, it is important to note the significant value that comes from political involvement especially aimed not only on raising awareness or affecting individuals, but also toward structural change(Bush and Little 2009). Learning aboutpolitical institutions**,** issues, contexts, and practices should be an integral part of that enterprise (liberal arts education). College graduates cannot make sense of their environment and their place in it if they are politically ignorant, unskilled, and lacking in a sense of civic agency, the sense that they can work with others to solve problems that concern them—in their communities, workplaces**,** .. ." (Colby 2008: 8 ) Overall, every opportunity to advance a broad-based and deepened understanding about the global dynamics of white supremacy, including its material impact on the lives of all people, should be pursued. This effort couldcultivate a counter narrative that deals with white racism from "cradle to grave."29 It can also provide incentive tothe large numbers of white peopleoutside the ruling class, whose acceptance of the status quo contributes to the entrenchment of the patterns of racial inequality and injustice that threaten our future, to perhaps redefine their allegiancesand reconfigure their notion of "who's to blame."

#### Third, predictable limits are good.

#### a. Switch side debate over environmental issues is critical to effective deliberation

Mitchell 10

(Gordon R., Associate Professor, Director of Graduate Studies, and Director of the William Pitt Debating Union at the University of Pittsburgh; Spring, “Switch-Side Debating Meets Demand-Driven Rhetoric of Science,” Rhetoric & Public Affairs, Vol. 13, No. 1 – Kurr)

The preceding analysis of U.S. intelligence community debating initiatives highlighted how analysts are challenged to navigate discursively the heteroglossia of vast amounts of different kinds of data flowing through intelligence streams. Public policy planners are tested in like manner when they attempt to stitch together institutional arguments from various and sundry inputs ranging from expert testimony, to historical precedent, to public comment. Just as intelligence managers find that algorithmic, formal methods of analysis often don't work when it comes to the task of interpreting and synthesizing copious amounts of disparate data, public-policy planners encounter similar challenges. In fact, the argumentative turn in public-policy planning elaborates an approach to public-policy analysis that foregrounds deliberative interchange and critical thinking as alternatives to "decisionism," the formulaic application of "objective" decision algorithms to the public policy process. Stating the matter plainly, Majone suggests, "whether in written or oral form, argument is central in all stages of the policy process." Accordingly, he notes, "we miss a great deal if we try to understand policy-making solely in terms of power, influence, and bargaining, to the exclusion of debate and argument."51 One can see similar rationales driving Goodwin and Davis's EPA debating project, where debaters are invited to conduct on-site public debates covering resolutions crafted to reflect key points of stasis in the EPA decision-making process. For example, in the 2008 Water Wars debates held at EPA headquarters in Washington, D.C., resolutions were crafted to focus attention on the topic of water pollution, with one resolution focusing on downstream states' authority to control upstream states' discharges and sources of pollutants, and a second resolution exploring the policy merits of bottled water and toilet paper taxes as revenue sources to fund water infrastructure projects. In the first debate on interstate river pollution, the team of Seth Gannon and Seungwon Chung from Wake Forest University argued in favor of downstream state control, with the Michigan State University team of Carly Wunderlich and Garrett Abelkop providing opposition. In the second debate on taxation policy, Kevin Kallmyer and Matthew Struth from University of Mary Washington defended taxes on bottled water and toilet paper, while their opponents from Howard University, Dominique Scott and Jarred McKee, argued against this proposal. Reflecting on the project, Goodwin noted how the intercollegiate [End Page 106] debaters' ability to act as "honest brokers" in the policy arguments contributed positively to internal EPA deliberation on both issues.52 Davis observed that since the invited debaters "didn't have a dog in the fight," they were able to give voice to previously buried arguments that some EPA subject matter experts felt reticent to elucidate because of their institutional affiliations.53 Such findings are consistent with the views of policy analysts advocating the argumentative turn in policy planning. As Majone claims, "Dialectical confrontation between generalists and experts often succeeds in bringing out unstated assumptions, conflicting interpretations of the facts, and the risks posed by new projects."54 Frank Fischer goes even further in this context, explicitly appropriating rhetorical scholar Charles Willard's concept of argumentative "epistemics" to flesh out his vision for policy studies: Uncovering the epistemic dynamics of public controversies would allow for a more enlightened understanding of what is at stake in a particular dispute, making possible a sophisticated evaluation of the various viewpoints and merits of different policy options. In so doing, the differing, often tacitly held contextual perspectives and values could be juxtaposed; the viewpoints and demands of experts, special interest groups, and the wider public could be directly compared; and the dynamics among the participants could be scrutizined. This would by no means sideline or even exclude scientific assessment; it would only situate it within the framework of a more comprehensive evaluation.55 As Davis notes, institutional constraints present within the EPA communicative milieu can complicate efforts to provide a full airing of all relevant arguments pertaining to a given regulatory issue. Thus, intercollegiate debaters can play key roles in retrieving and amplifying positions that might otherwise remain sedimented in the policy process. The dynamics entailed in this symbiotic relationship are underscored by deliberative planner John Forester, who observes, "If planners and public administrators are to make democratic political debate and argument possible, they will need strategically located allies to avoid being fully thwarted by the characteristic self-protecting behaviors of the planning organizations and bureaucracies within which they work."56 Here, an institution's need for "strategically located allies" to support deliberative practice constitutes the demand for rhetorically informed expertise, setting up what can be considered a demand-driven rhetoric of science. As an instance of rhetoric of science scholarship, this type of "switch-side public [End Page 107] debate"57 differs both from insular contest tournament debating, where the main focus is on the pedagogical benefit for student participants, and first-generation rhetoric of science scholarship, where critics concentrated on unmasking the rhetoricity of scientific artifacts circulating in what many perceived to be purely technical spheres of knowledge production.58 As a form of demand-driven rhetoric of science, switch-side debating connects directly with the communication field's performative tradition of argumentative engagement in public controversy—a different route of theoretical grounding than rhetorical criticism's tendency to locate its foundations in the English field's tradition of literary criticism and textual analysis.59 Given this genealogy, it is not surprising to learn how Davis's response to the EPA's institutional need for rhetorical expertise took the form of a public debate proposal, shaped by Davis's dual background as a practitioner and historian of intercollegiate debate. Davis competed as an undergraduate policy debater for Howard University in the 1970s, and then went on to enjoy substantial success as coach of the Howard team in the new millennium. In an essay reviewing the broad sweep of debating history, Davis notes, "Academic debate began at least 2,400 years ago when the scholar Protagoras of Abdera (481–411 BC), known as the father of debate, conducted debates among his students in Athens."60 As John Poulakos points out, "older" Sophists such as Protagoras taught Greek students the value of dissoi logoi, or pulling apart complex questions by debating two sides of an issue.61 The few surviving fragments of Protagoras's work suggest that his notion of dissoi logoi stood for the principle that "two accounts [logoi] are present about every 'thing,' opposed to each other," and further, that humans could "measure" the relative soundness of knowledge claims by engaging in give-and-take where parties would make the "weaker argument stronger" to activate the generative aspect of rhetorical practice, a key element of the Sophistical tradition.62 Following in Protagoras's wake, Isocrates would complement this centrifugal push with the pull of synerchésthé, a centripetal exercise of "coming together" deliberatively to listen, respond, and form common social bonds.63 Isocrates incorporated Protagorean dissoi logoi into synerchésthé, a broader concept that he used flexibly to express interlocking senses of (1) inquiry, as in groups convening to search for answers to common questions through discussion;64 (2) deliberation, with interlocutors gathering in a political setting to deliberate about proposed courses of action;65 and (3) alliance formation, a form of collective action typical at festivals,66 or in the exchange of pledges that deepen social ties.67 [End Page 108] Returning once again to the Kettering-informed sharp distinction between debate and deliberation, one sees in Isocratic synerchésthé, as well as in the EPA debating initiative, a fusion of debate with deliberative functions. Echoing a theme raised in this essay's earlier discussion of intelligence tradecraft, such a fusion troubles categorical attempts to classify debate and deliberation as fundamentally opposed activities. The significance of such a finding is amplified by the frequency of attempts in the deliberative democracy literature to insist on the theoretical bifurcation of debate and deliberation as an article of theoretical faith. Tandem analysis of the EPA and intelligence community debating initiatives also brings to light dimensions of contrast at the third level of Isocratic synerchésthé, alliance formation. The intelligence community's Analytic Outreach initiative invites largely one-way communication flowing from outside experts into the black box of classified intelligence analysis. On the contrary, the EPA debating program gestures toward a more expansive project of deliberative alliance building. In this vein, Howard University's participation in the 2008 EPA Water Wars debates can be seen as the harbinger of a trend by historically black colleges and universities (HBCUS) to catalyze their debate programs in a strategy that evinces Davis's dual-focus vision. On the one hand, Davis aims to recuperate Wiley College's tradition of competitive excellence in intercollegiate debate, depicted so powerfully in the feature film The Great Debaters, by starting a wave of new debate programs housed in HBCUS across the nation.68 On the other hand, Davis sees potential for these new programs to complement their competitive debate programming with participation in the EPA's public debating initiative. This dual-focus vision recalls Douglas Ehninger's and Wayne Brockriede's vision of "total" debate programs that blend switch-side intercollegiate tournament debating with forms of public debate designed to contribute to wider communities beyond the tournament setting.69 Whereas the political telos animating Davis's dual-focus vision certainly embraces background assumptions that Greene and Hicks would find disconcerting—notions of liberal political agency, the idea of debate using "words as weapons"70—there is little doubt that the project of pursuing environmental protection by tapping the creative energy of HBCU-leveraged dissoi logoi differs significantly from the intelligence community's effort to improve its tradecraft through online digital debate programming. Such difference is especially evident in light of the EPA's commitment to extend debates to public realms, with the attendant possible benefits unpacked by Jane Munksgaard and Damien Pfister: [End Page 109] Having a public debater argue against their convictions, or confess their indecision on a subject and subsequent embrace of argument as a way to seek clarity, could shake up the prevailing view of debate as a war of words. Public uptake of the possibility of switch-sides debate may help lessen the polarization of issues inherent in prevailing debate formats because students are no longer seen as wedded to their arguments. This could transform public debate from a tussle between advocates, with each public debater trying to convince the audience in a Manichean struggle about the truth of their side, to a more inviting exchange focused on the content of the other's argumentation and the process of deliberative exchange.71 Reflection on the EPA debating initiative reveals a striking convergence among (1) the expressed need for dissoi logoi by government agency officials wrestling with the challenges of inverted rhetorical situations, (2) theoretical claims by scholars regarding the centrality of argumentation in the public policy process, and (3) the practical wherewithal of intercollegiate debaters to tailor public switch-side debating performances in specific ways requested by agency collaborators. These points of convergence both underscore previously articulated theoretical assertions regarding the relationship of debate to deliberation, as well as deepen understanding of the political role of deliberation in institutional decision making. But they also suggest how decisions by rhetorical scholars about whether to contribute switch-side debating acumen to meet demand-driven rhetoric of science initiatives ought to involve careful reflection. Such an approach mirrors the way policy planning in the "argumentative turn" is designed to respond to the weaknesses of formal, decisionistic paradigms of policy planning with situated, contingent judgments informed by reflective deliberation.

#### b. Effective deliberation requires predictable points of stasis – its key to overcome politically debilitating self-obsession
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Totalitarianism and the Competitive Space of Agonism Arendt is probably most famous for her analysis of totalitarianism (especially her The Origins of Totalitarianism andEichmann in Jerusa¬lem), but the recent attention has been on her criticism of mass culture (The Human Condition). Arendt's main criticism of the current human condition is that the common world of deliberate and joint action is fragmented into solipsistic and unreflective behavior. In an especially lovely passage, she says that in mass society people are all imprisoned in the subjectivity of their own singular experience, which does not cease to be singular if the same experience is multiplied innumerable times. The end of the common world has come when it is seen only under one aspect and is permitted to present itself in only one perspective. (Human 58) What Arendt so beautifully describes is that isolation and individualism are not corollaries, and may even be antithetical because obsession with one's own self and the particularities of one's life prevents one from engaging in conscious, deliberate, collective action. Individuality, unlike isolation, depends upon a collective with whom one argues in order to direct the common life. Self-obsession, even (especially?) when coupled with isolation from one' s community is far from apolitical; it has political consequences. Perhaps a better way to put it is that it is political precisely because it aspires to be apolitical. This fragmented world in which many people live simultaneously and even similarly but not exactly together is what Arendt calls the "social." Arendt does not mean that group behavior is impossible in the realm of the social, but that social behavior consists "in some way of isolated individuals, incapable of solidarity or mutuality, who abdicate their human capacities and responsibilities to a projected 'they' or 'it,' with disastrous consequences, both for other people and eventually for themselves" (Pitkin 79). One can behave, butnot act. For someone like Arendt, a German-assimilated Jew, one of the most frightening aspects of the Holocaust was the ease with which a people who had not been extraordinarily anti-Semitic could be put to work industriously and efficiently on the genocide of the Jews. And what was striking about the perpetrators of the genocide, ranging from minor functionaries who facilitated the murder transports up to major figures on trial at Nuremberg, was their constant and apparently sincere insistence that they were not responsible. For Arendt, this was not a peculiarity of the German people, but of the current human and heavily bureaucratic condition of twentieth-century culture: we do not consciously choose to engage in life's activities; we drift into them, or we do them out of a desire to conform. Even while we do them, we do not acknowledge an active, willed choice to do them; instead, we attribute our behavior to necessity, and we perceive ourselves as determined—determined by circumstance, by accident, by what "they" tell us to do. We do something from within the anonymity of a mob that we would never do as an individual; we do things for which we will not take responsibility. Yet, whether or not people acknowledge responsibil¬ity for the consequences of their actions, those consequences exist. Refusing to accept responsibility can even make those consequences worse, in that the people who enact the actions in question, because they do not admit their own agency, cannot be persuaded to stop those actions. They are simply doing their jobs. In a totalitarian system, however, everyone is simply doing his or her job; there never seems to be anyone who can explain, defend, and change the policies. Thus, it is, as Arendt says, rule by nobody. It is illustrative to contrast Arendt's attitude toward discourse to Habermas'. While both are critical of modern bureaucratic and totalitar¬ian systems, Arendt's solution is the playful and competitive space of agonism; it is not the rational-critical public sphere. The "actual content of political life" is "the joy and the gratification that arise out of being in company with our peers, out of acting together and appearing in public, out of inserting ourselves into the world by word and deed, thus acquiring and sustaining our personal identity and beginning something entirely new" ("Truth" 263). According to Seyla Benhabib, Arendt's public realm emphasizes the assumption of competition, and it "represents that space of appearances in which moral and political greatness, heroism, and preeminence are revealed, displayed, shared with others. This is a competitive space in which one competes for recognition, precedence, and acclaim" (78). These qualities are displayed, but not entirely for purposes of acclamation; they are not displays of one's self, but of ideas and arguments, of one's thought. When Arendt discusses Socrates' thinking in public, she emphasizes his performance: "He performed in the marketplace the way the flute-player performed at a banquet. It is sheer performance, sheer activity"; nevertheless, it was thinking: "What he actually did was to make public, in discourse, the thinking process" {Lectures 37). Pitkin summarizes this point: "Arendt says that the heroism associated with politics is not the mythical machismo of ancient Greece but something more like the existential leap into action and public exposure" (175-76). Just as it is not machismo, although it does have considerable ego involved, so it is not instrumental rationality; Arendt's discussion of the kinds of discourse involved in public action include myths, stories, and personal narratives. Furthermore, the competition is not ruthless; it does not imply a willingness to triumph at all costs. Instead, it involves something like having such a passion for ideas and politics that one is willing to take risks. One tries to articulate the best argument, propose the best policy, design the best laws, make the best response. This is a risk in that one might lose; advancing an argument means that one must be open to the criticisms others will make of it. The situation is agonistic not because the participants manufacture or seek conflict, but because conflict is a necessary consequence of difference. This attitude is reminiscent of Kenneth Burke, who did not try to find a language free of domination but who instead theorized a way that the very tendency toward hierarchy in language might be used against itself (for more on this argument, see Kastely). Similarly, Arendt does not propose a public realm of neutral, rational beings who escape differences to live in the discourse of universals; she envisions one of different people who argue with passion, vehemence, and integrity. Continued… Eichmann perfectly exemplified what Arendt famously called the "banal¬ity of evil" but that might be better thought of as the bureaucratization of evil (or, as a friend once aptly put it, the evil of banality). That is, he was able to engage in mass murder because he was able not to think about it, especially not from the perspective of the victims, and he was able to exempt himself from personal responsibility by telling himself (and anyone else who would listen) that he was just following orders. It was the bureaucratic system that enabled him to do both. He was not exactly passive; he was, on the contrary, very aggressive in trying to do his duty. He behaved with the "ruthless, competitive exploitation" and "inauthen-tic, self-disparaging conformism" that characterizes those who people totalitarian systems (Pitkin 87). Arendt's theorizing of totalitarianism has been justly noted as one of her strongest contributions to philosophy. She saw that a situation like Nazi Germany is different from the conventional understanding of a tyranny. Pitkin writes, Totalitarianism cannot be understood, like earlier forms of domination, as the ruthless exploitation of some people by others, whether the motive be selfish calculation, irrational passion, or devotion to some cause. Understanding totalitarianism's essential nature requires solving the central mystery of the holocaust—the objectively useless and indeed dysfunctional, fanatical pursuit of a purely ideological policy, a pointless process to which the people enacting it have fallen captive. (87) Totalitarianism is closely connected to bureaucracy; it is oppression by rules, rather than by people who have willfully chosen to establish certain rules. It is the triumph of the social. Critics (both friendly and hostile) have paid considerable attention to Arendt's category of the "social," largely because, despite spending so much time on the notion, Arendt remains vague on certain aspects of it. Pitkin appropriately compares Arendt's concept of the social to the Blob, the type of monster that figured in so many post-war horror movies. That Blob was "an evil monster from outer space, entirely external to and separate from us [that] had fallen upon us intent on debilitating, absorb¬ing, and ultimately destroying us, gobbling up our distinct individuality and turning us into robots that mechanically serve its purposes" (4). Pitkin is critical of this version of the "social" and suggests that Arendt meant (or perhaps should have meant) something much more complicated. The simplistic version of the social-as-Blob can itself be an instance of Blob thinking; Pitkin's criticism is that Arendt talks at times as though the social comes from outside of us and has fallen upon us, turning us into robots. Yet, Arendt's major criticism of the social is that it involves seeing ourselves as victimized by something that comes from outside our own behavior. I agree with Pitkin that Arendt's most powerful descriptions of the social (and the other concepts similar to it, such as her discussion of totalitarianism, imperialism, Eichmann, and parvenus) emphasize that these processes are not entirely out of our control but that they happen to us when, and because, we keep refusing to make active choices. We create the social through negligence. It is not the sort of force in a Sorcerer's Apprentice, which once let loose cannot be stopped; on the contrary, it continues to exist because we structure our world to reward social behavior. Pitkin writes, "From childhood on, in virtually all our institutions, we reward euphemism, salesmanship, slo¬gans, and we punish and suppress truth-telling, originality, thoughtful-ness. So we continually cultivate ways of (not) thinking that induce the social" (274). I want to emphasize this point, as it is important for thinking about criticisms of some forms of the social construction of knowledge: denying our own agency is what enables the social to thrive. To put it another way, theories of powerlessness are self-fulfilling prophecies. Arendt grants that there are people who willed the Holocaust, but she insists that totalitarian systems result not so much from the Hitlers or Stalins as from the bureaucrats who may or may not agree with the established ideology but who enforce the rules for no stronger motive than a desire to avoid trouble with their superiors (see Eichmann and Life). They do not think about what they do. One might prevent such occurrences—or, at least, resist the modern tendency toward totalitarian¬ism—by thought: "critical thought is in principle anti-authoritarian" (Lectures 38). By "thought" Arendt does not mean eremitic contemplation; in fact, she has great contempt for what she calls "professional thinkers," refusing herself to become a philosopher or to call her work philosophy. Young-Bruehl, Benhabib, and Pitkin have each said that Heidegger represented just such a professional thinker for Arendt, and his embrace of Nazism epitomized the genuine dangers such "thinking" can pose (see Arendt's "Heidegger"). "Thinking" is not typified by the isolated con¬templation of philosophers; it requires the arguments of others and close attention to the truth. It is easy to overstate either part of that harmony. One must consider carefully the arguments and viewpoints of others: Political thought is representative. I form an opinion by considering a given issue from different viewpoints, by making present to my mind the standpoints of those who are absent; that is, I represent them. This process of representation does not blindly adopt the actual views of those who stand somewhere else, and hence look upon the world from a different perspective; this is a question neither of empathy, as though I tried to be or to feel like somebody else, nor of counting noses and joining a majority but of being and thinking in my own identity where actually I am not. The more people's standpoints I have present in my mind while I am ponder¬ing a given issue, and the better I can imagine how I would feel and think if I were in their place, the stronger will be my capacity for represen¬tative thinking and the more valid my final conclusions, my opinion. ("Truth" 241) There are two points to emphasize in this wonderful passage. First, one does not get these standpoints in one's mind through imagining them, but through listening to them; thus, good thinking requires that one hear the arguments of other people. Hence, as Arendt says, "critical thinking, while still a solitary business, does not cut itself off from' all others.'" Thinking is, in this view, necessarily public discourse: critical thinking is possible "only where the standpoints of all others are open to inspection" (Lectures 43). Yet, it is not a discourse in which one simply announces one's stance; participants are interlocutors and not just speakers; they must listen. Unlike many current versions of public discourse, this view presumes that speech matters. It is not asymmetric manipulation of others, nor merely an economic exchange; it must be a world into which one enters and by which one might be changed. Second, passages like the above make some readers think that Arendt puts too much faith in discourse and too little in truth (see Habermas). But Arendt is no crude relativist; she believes in truth, and she believes that there are facts that can be more or less distorted. She does not believe that reality is constructed by discourse, or that truth is indistinguishable from falsehood. She insists tha^ the truth has a different pull on us and, consequently, that it has a difficult place in the world of the political. Facts are different from falsehood because, while they can be distorted or denied, especially when they are inconvenient for the powerful, they also have a certain positive force that falsehood lacks: "Truth, though powerless and always defe ated in a head-on clash with the powers that be, possesses a strength of its own: whatever those in power may contrive, they are unable to discover or invent a viable substitute for it. Persuasion and violence can destroy truth, but they cannot replace it" ("Truth" 259). Facts have a strangely resilient quality partially because a lie "tears, as it were, a hole in the fabric of factuality. As every historian knows, one can spot a lie by noticing incongruities, holes, or the j unctures of patched-up places" ("Truth" 253). While she is sometimes discouraging about our ability to see the tears in the fabric, citing the capacity of totalitarian governments to create the whole cloth (see "Truth" 252-54), she is also sometimes optimistic. InEichmann in Jerusalem, she repeats the story of Anton Schmidt—a man who saved the lives of Jews—and concludes that such stories cannot be silenced (230-32). For facts to exert power in the common world, however, these stories must be told. Rational truth (such as principles of mathematics) might be perceptible and demonstrable through individual contemplation, but "factual truth, on the contrary, is always related to other people: it concerns events and circumstances in which many are involved; it is established by witnesses and depends upon testimony; it exists only to the extent that it is spoken about, even if it occurs in the domain of privacy. It is political by nature" (23 8). Arendt is neither a positivist who posits an autonomous individual who can correctly perceive truth, nor a relativist who positively asserts the inherent relativism of all perception. Her description of how truth functions does not fall anywhere in the three-part expeditio so prevalent in bothrhetoric and philosophy: it is not expressivist, positivist, or social constructivist. Good thinking depends upon good public argument, and good public argument depends upon access to facts: "Freedom of opinion is a farce unless factual information is guaranteed" (238). The sort of thinking that Arendt propounds takes the form of action only when it is public argument, and, as such, it is particularly precious: "For if no other test but the experience of being active, no other measure but the extent of sheer activity were to be applied to the various activities within the vita activa, it might well be that thinking as such would surpass them all" (Human 325). Arendt insists that it is "the same general rule— Do not contradict yourself (not your self but your thinking ego)—that determines both thinking and acting" (Lectures 3 7). In place of the mildly resentful conformism that fuels totalitarianism, Arendt proposes what Pitkin calls "a tough-minded, open-eyed readiness to perceive and judge reality for oneself, in terms of concrete experience and independent, critical theorizing" (274). The paradoxical nature of agonism (that it must involve both individuality and commonality) makes it difficult to maintain, as the temptation is great either to think one's own thoughts without reference to anyone else or to let others do one's thinking. Arendt's Polemical Agonism As I said, agonism does have its advocates within rhetoric—Burke, Ong, Sloane, Gage, and Jarratt, for instance—but while each of these theorists proposes a form of conflictual argument, not one of these is as adversarial as Arendt's. Agonism can emphasize persuasion, as does John Gage's textbook The Shape of Reason or William Brandt et al.'s The Craft of Writing. That is, the goal of the argument is to identify the disagreement and then construct a text that gains the assent of the audience. This is not the same as what Gage (citing Thomas Conley) calls "asymmetrical theories of rhetoric": theories that "presuppose an active speaker and a passive audience, a speaker whose rhetorical task is therefore to do something to that audience" ("Reasoned" 6). Asymmetric rhetoric is not and cannot be agonistic. Persuasive agonism still values conflict, disagreement, and equality among interlocutors, but it has the goal of reaching agreement, as when Gage says that the process of argument should enable one's reasons to be "understood and believed" by others (Shape 5; emphasis added). Arendt's version is what one might call polemical agonism: it puts less emphasis on gaining assent, and it is exemplified both in Arendt's own writing and in Donald Lazere's "Ground Rules for Polemicists" and "Teaching the Political Conflicts." Both forms of agonism (persuasive and polemical) require substantive debate at two points in a long and recursive process. First, one engages in debate in order to invent one's argument; even silent thinking is a "dialogue of myself with myself (Lectures 40). The difference between the two approaches to agonism is clearest when one presents an argument to an audience assumed to be an opposition. In persuasive agonism, one plays down conflict and moves through reasons to try to persuade one's audience. In polemical agonism, however, one's intention is not necessarily to prove one's case, but to make public one' s thought in order to test it. In this way, communicability serves the same function in philosophy that replicability serves in the sciences; it is how one tests the validity of one's thought. In persuasive agonism, success is achieved through persuasion; in polemical agonism, success may be marked through the quality of subsequent controversy. Arendt quotes from a letter Kant wrote on this point: You know that I do not approach reasonable objections with the intention merely of refuting them, but that in thinking them over I always weave them into my judgments, and afford them the opportunity of overturning all my most cherished beliefs. I entertain the hope that by thus viewing my judgments impartially from the standpoint of others some third view that will improve upon my previous insight may be obtainable. {Lectures 42) Kant's use of "impartial" here is interesting: he is not describing a stance that is free of all perspective; it is impartial only in the sense that it is not his own view. This is the same way that Arendt uses the term; she does not advocate any kind of positivistic rationality, but instead a "universal interdependence" ("Truth" 242). She does not place the origin of the "disinterested pursuit of truth" in science, but at "the moment when Homer chose to sing the deeds of the Trojans no less than those of the Achaeans, and to praise the glory of Hector, the foe and the defeated man, no less than the glory of Achilles, the hero of his kinfolk" ("Truth" 262¬63). It is useful to note that Arendt tends not to use the term "universal," opting more often for "common," by which she means both what is shared and what is ordinary, a usage that evades many of the problems associated with universalism while preserving its virtues (for a brief butprovocative application of Arendt's notion of common, see Hauser 100-03). In polemical agonism, there is a sense in which one' s main goal is not to persuade one's readers; persuading one's readers, if this means that they fail to see errors and flaws in one' s argument, might actually be a sort of failure. It means that one wishes to put forward an argument that makes clear what one's stance is and why one holds it, but with the intention of provoking critique and counterargument. Arendt describes Kant's "hope" for his writings not that the number of people who agree with him would increase but "that the circle of his examiners would gradually be en¬larged" {Lectures 39); he wanted interlocutors, not acolytes. This is not consensus-based argument, nor is it what is sometimes called "consociational argument," nor is this argument as mediation or conflict resolution. Arendt (and her commentators) use the term "fight," and they mean it. When Arendt describes the values that are necessary in our world, she says, "They are a sense of honor, desire for fame and glory, the spirit of fighting without hatred and 'without the spirit of revenge,' and indifference to material advantages" {Crises 167). Pitkin summarizes Arendt's argument: "Free citizenship presupposes the ability to fight— openly, seriously, with commitment, and about things that really mat¬ter—without fanaticism, without seeking to exterminate one's oppo¬nents" (266). My point here is two-fold: first, there is not a simple binary opposition between persuasive discourse and eristic discourse, the conflictual versus the collaborative, or argument as opposed to debate. Second, while polemical agonismrequires diversity among interlocutors, and thus seems an extraordinarily appropriate notion, and while it may be a useful corrective to too much emphasis on persuasion, it seems to me that polemical agonism could easily slide into the kind of wrangling that is simply frustrating. Arendt does not describe just how one is to keep the conflict useful. Although she rejects the notion that politics is "no more than a battlefield of partial, conflicting interests, where nothing countfs] but pleasure and profit, partisanship, and the lust for dominion," she does not say exactly how we are to know when we are engaging in the existential leap of argument versus when we are lusting for dominion ("Truth" 263). Like other proponents of agonism, Arendt argues that rhetoric does not lead individuals or communities to ultimate Truth; it leads to decisions that will necessarily have to be reconsidered. Even Arendt, who tends to express a greater faith than many agonists (such as Burke, Sloane, or Kastely) in the ability of individuals to perceive truth, insists that self-deception is always a danger, so public discourse is necessary as a form of testing (see especially Lectures and "Truth"). She remarks that it is difficult to think beyond one's self-interest and that "nothing, indeed, is more common, even among highly sophisticated people, than the blind obstinacy that becomes manifest in lack of imagination and failure to judge" ("Truth" 242). Agonism demands that one simultaneously trust and doubt one' s own perceptions, rely on one's own judgment and consider the judgments of others, think for oneself and imagine how others think. The question remains whether this is a kind of thought in which everyone can engage. Is the agonistic public sphere (whether political, academic, or scientific) only available to the few? Benhabib puts this criticism in the form of a question: "That is, is the 'recovery of the public space' under conditions of modernity necessarily an elitist and antidemocratic project that can hardly be reconciled with the demand for universal political emancipa¬tion and the universal extension of citizenship rights that have accompa¬nied modernity since the American and French Revolutions?" (75). This is an especially troubling question not only because Arendt's examples of agonistic rhetoric are from elitist cultures, but also because of com¬ments she makes, such as this one from The Human Condition: "As a living experience, thought has always been assumed, perhaps wrongly, to be known only to the few. It may not be presumptuous to believe that these few have not become fewer in our time" {Human 324). Yet, there are important positive political consequences of agonism. Arendt' s own promotion of the agonistic sphere helps to explain how the system could be actively moral. It is not an overstatement to say that a central theme in Arendt's work is the evil of conformity—the fact that the modern bureaucratic state makes possible extraordinary evil carried out by people who do not even have any ill will toward their victims. It does so by "imposing innumerable and various rules, all of which tend to 'normalize' its members, to make them behave, to exclude spontaneous action or outstanding achievement" (Human 40). It keeps people from thinking, and it keeps them behaving. The agonistic model's celebration of achievement and verbal skill undermines the political force of conformity, so it is a force against the bureaucratizing of evil. If people think for themselves, they will resist dogma; if people think of themselves as one of many, they will empathize; if people can do both, they will resist totalitarianism. And if they talk about what they see, tell their stories, argue about their perceptions, and listen to one another—that is, engage in rhetoric—then they are engaging in antitotalitarian action. In post-Ramistic rhetoric, it is a convention to have a thesis, and one might well wonder just what mine is—whether I am arguing for or against Arendt's agonism. Arendt does not lay out a pedagogy for us to follow (although one might argue that, if she had, it would lookmuch like the one Lazere describes in "Teaching"), so I am not claiming that greater attention to Arendt would untangle various pedagogical problems that teachers of writing face. Nor am I claiming that applying Arendt's views will resolve theoretical arguments that occupy scholarly journals. I am saying, on the one hand, that Arendt's connection of argument and thinking, as well as her perception that both serve to thwart totalitarian¬ism, suggest that agonal rhetoric (despite the current preference for collaborative rhetoric) is the best discourse for a diverse and inclusive public sphere. On the other hand, Arendt's advocacy of agonal rhetoric is troubling (and, given her own admiration for Kant, this may be intentional), especially in regard to its potential elitism, masculinism, failure to describe just how to keep argument from collapsing into wrangling, and apparently cheerful acceptance of hierarchy. Even with these flaws, Arendt describes something we would do well to consider thoughtfully: a fact-based but not positivist, communally grounded but not relativist, adversarial but not violent, independent but not expressivist rhetoric.

### 2

#### The affirmative’s claim to performatively effect change against capitalism locates agency in rhetorical performances like the precious 1ac. this shuts down materialist coalitional anti-capitalist movements.
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Notably, Campbell’s statement on the status of agency does not attempt to reverse the posthumanist turn, but rather, sets out to reconcile the theoretical perspectives of Judith Butler and Michelle Balif with close textual reading practices that, until the crisis of agency, were assumed to have singular, self-transparent authors. Similarly,¶ John Lucaites’ call to jettison agency as a concept and locate power, instead, in historically particular rhetorical performances ‘‘in relationship to a set of perceived or constituted tensions . . . between cultural, institutional, and technological norms and structures’’ is a theoretical compromise: Agency is best understood on a caseby-case basis, leading to a multiplicity of conceptions of agency (Lucaites, 2003, paras. 1–2). Carolyn R. Miller’s (2007) recharacterization of agency as an attribution that makes certain kinds of symbolic action possible also ﬁgures a subject’s actions between the constraints of an exterior and the motives of an interior. The most widely known, explicitly dialectical positions on agency in rhetorical studies, however, are those of James Arnt Aune, Dana Cloud, and other Marxist critics. For example, critical of certain posthumanist theories of agency (namely, those of Greene 1998; 2004; 2007), Cloud, Macek, & Aune (2006) argue that social groups, especially class-based groups, harbor a capacity for political action grounded in their material circumstances: Either workers and their allies claim the real agency of that they possess and take the chance of making a world in which they are free in body as well as mind; or they resign themselves to generation after generation of grinding exploitation, settling for the meaningful but insufﬁcient consolations of sporadic, creative, ungrounded, and symbolic resistance. (2006, p. 81) Cloud, Macek, & Aune (2006) argue not only that ordinary people must mobilize collectively in order to pressure or overthrow employers and institutions, but also that it is the intersection of consciousness and experience that is generative of agency. In other words, as Cloud (2005) explains, working class agency is a product of both the experience of embodied labor and explicit political intervention and collective organizing. Agency in this view is not primarily characteristic of individuals; rather, the working class is a particular kind of collective agent that can manifest a real challenge to the capitalist system. In contrast, to believe that one can individually effect political change, or worse, to believe that one is powerless to effect political change, is to succumb to oppressive structures, economic and otherwise. Again, agency is located in the tensions between a larger structure and the (collective)¶ subject (also see Jameson, 1977).

#### The working class must coalesce in material action against financial exploitation especially in the context of energy planning. The aff’s notion of agency uniquely undermines the materialist anti-capitalist revolutionary knowledge key to survival

Callinicos 2k10

[Alex, Bonfire of Illusions: The Twin Crisis of the Liberal World, Polity, professor of European studies King’s College – London, DPhil – Oxford, p. 139-43]

There are other strong reasons to press for a break with the logic of competitive accumulation. The scientific evi-dence that the emission of greenhouse gases - most notably C02 - caused by human activity is generating profound and irreversible processes of climate change is now beyond dispute. It is also very widely agreed that preventing these processes reaching a disastrous scale requires the rapid adoption and implementation of drastic targets for cutting CO2 emissions. But while the targets, particularly since the eclipse of the Bush gang, have become more ambitious, the actual emissions have continued to rise. The most plausible explanation appeals to the logic of competition. The problem is, yet again, one of collective action. Evi- dently it is in everyone's interest to avoid drastic climate change. But no individual capital or state is willing to shoulder the additional costs involved in moving to a low- carbon economy. In international negotiations, the leading states play a game of pass-the-parcel - the US demanding that India and China adopt tough targets, the latter asking why they should bear the burden of two centuries of industrialization mainly in the North. The EU, despite its pre- tensions to be a master of 'soft power' that has transcended bad old nationalism, is particularly ineffectual. Germany has vocally and largely successfully defended its car firms against what they regarded as excessively tough targets. And the economic crisis has provided many governments with a perfect excuse to go slow in reducing reliance on fossil fuels. The logic of competitive accumulation here threatens the future of the human species.20 The implication is that any sustainable alternative to •capitalism has to be based, not on the market, but on democratic planning. In a democratically planned economy the allocation of resources would be the outcome of a democratic political process that would set overall priori- ties for the economy. There are some models of how this could work. One is Albert's Parecon, or participatory economics. This involves an economy of workers' and consumers' councils in which individuals and enterprises submit proposals for their share of society's resources and a process of gradual adjustments (Albert calls them 'iterations') takes place while technical experts come up with a plan that would give everyone as much as possible of what they want. The main weakness of this model is that it mimics a bit too closely the workings of a market economy, in which claims on resources are driven by individual demands. Albert is an anarchist, and his commitment to decentralization here goes too far. The allocation of society's resources isn't a neutral technical issue. It's a political question that requires some sort of collective and democratic decision-making process to choose between what would often be competing views of the priorities of the society in question. From this perspective, Pat Devine offers a superior model of what he calls negotiated coordination. Here the allocation of resources is largely the outcome of discussion between producers, consumers and other affected groups, but within the framework of overall decisions about economic priorities made democratically at the national and international level.21 Plainly there is much more to be said - and, above all, to be done - about democratic planning. All the same, the importance of the kind of work being done by Albert Devine and others is that they begin to break down the prejudice against planning and to sketch out how an economy that rejected the market could manage to be both democratic and efficient. But any break with capitalism couldn't take the form of an instantaneous leap into a fully planned economy. Marx long ago argued in the 'Critique of the Gotha Programme' that a new workers' state would inherit a society deeply marked by capitalism. Initially, it would have to make compromises with the old order, and gradually move towards a society governed by the communist principle 'From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!'22 Similarly today a government breaking with capitalism would need to make a decisive shift towards an economy in which priorities were decided democratically rather than left to the anarchy of competition. This would involve critically taking control of the financial markets, nationalizing under workers' control key sectors of the economy, and extending social provision on the basis of a progressive tax system that redistributed wealth and income from rich to poor. These measures, radical though they are, would still leave in place many aspects of a market economy. Large sectors would remain in private hands. Continuous pressure and the introduction of new mea- sures would be necessary to move the economy as a whole towards the principles of democratic planning. One key step would be to weaken the power of the capitalist labour market, which today rules our lives. In my view, the best way to do this would be to intro- duce universal direct income. In other words, every resi- dent of the country would receive, as of right, an income that met their basic needs at a relatively low but neverthe- less decent level. This would serve two goals. First, it would ensure a basic level of welfare for everyone much more efficiently than existing systems of social provision. (People with greater needs because they had children or were disabled or whatever would receive a higher basic income.) Secondly, having a guaranteed basic income would greatly reduce the pressure on individuals to accept whatever job was on offer on the labour market. One of the main presuppositions of capitalism - that workers have no acceptable alternative to wage labour - would be removed. The balance of power between labour and capital would shift towards the workers, irrespective of the nature of their employer.23 More broadly, the question of power is crucial. One obvious challenge to the kind of vision of change I have just sketched out is how to ensure that the direction of change would be towards a democratically planned economy rather than back to market capitalism or maybe to the kind of state capitalism that ended up dominating the Soviet Union. The only guarantee that counts is that levers of political power are in the hands of the workers and the poor themselves. As long as the state takes the form that it does today, of a bureaucratically organized, hierarchical set of apparatuses whose managers' interests are bound up with those of capital, any improvement in society can only be temporary and fragile. This is why the strategy of ignoring the state advocated by Holloway is so badly mistaken. If we are to move towards a democratically planned economy, then the existing state has to be confronted and broken. This task can only be achieved through the development of a different kind of power, one based on the self- organization of workers and other poor people that devel- ops out of their struggles against capital. The great revolutionary movements of the twentieth century offered some glimpses of this power - from the workers' and sol- diers' councils of the Russian Revolution of October 1917 to the workers' shoras during the Iranian Revolution of 1978-9. The self-organization displayed by the Bolivian popular movement during the insurrections of October 2003 and May-June 2005 showed that the contemporary movements against neoliberalism can generate this kind of power as well.24 A democratically planned economy would be the core of a self-managing society, one in which directly elected workplace and neighbourhood councils took responsibil- ity for their own affairs and linked together to make deci- sions for society at large. The key insight that Marx had during the Paris Commune of 1871 was that these forms of organization would develop before the new society was created, in the process of fighting the old society. The same methods of self-organization that would be the basis of a self-managing society are needed by the exploited and oppressed to resist and, ultimately, to overthrow capital itself. The overthrow of capital is itself a process. The dilemma that Albert imagines confronting a workers' cooperative in a market economy would face any society that was beginning to introduce the principles of democratic plan- ning in a world still ruled by capitalism. It was responsible for the corruption and eventual destruction of the Russian Revolution of October 1917. Any breakthrough in one part of the world could only survive by spreading and progressively overturning the logic of capital on a global scale. The globalization of capital has produced a global- ization of resistance. Struggles in different parts of the world contaminate each other. Chiapas and Seattle had global reverberations. The two European countries with the most advanced and combative social movements, France and Greece, have exerted a degree of mutual influ- ence on one another. The movements in Latin America have become a beacon to all those fighting neoliberalism. "We are still a very long way from overturning capitalism even in one country. Indeed, the more one seeks to elabo- rate on the shape of an alternative to capitalism the more one is overawed by the immensity of the task. The biggest immediate obstacle that confronts anyone seeking to address it is the chronic political weakness of the radical anticapitalist left on a global scale. Nevertheless, the present crisis has torn a huge hole in neoliberalism both as an ideology and as a mode of organizing capital- ism. The market no longer seems like a second nature unamenable to change or control. Those who are prepared to seize this moment boldly can help to ensure that the boundaries of the possible really are widened, allowing the billions of victims of capitalism finally to escape.

#### Alternative text: vote negative to reject the 1ac in favor of materialist revolutionary knowledge production against capitalism.

#### Ecological catastrophe necessitates materialist revolutionary dialectics against capitalism’s exploitation to ensure survival.

Foster 2k11

[john bellamy,  professor of sociology at the University of Oregon and also editor of Monthly Review, Since the Great Financial Crisis hit in 2008, Foster has been sought out by academics, activists, the media, and the general public as a result of his earlier prescient writings on the coming crisis. He has given numerous interviews, talks, and invited lectures, as well as written invited commentary, articles, and books on the subject]

In the twenty-first century it is customary to view the rise of planetary ecological problems as a surprising development scarcely conceivable prior to the last few decades. It is here, however, that we have the most to learn from the analysis of nineteenth-century thinkers who played a role in the development of ecology, including both early ecological scientists and classical historical materialists. Science has long warned of the negative, destructive side of the human transformation of the earth—a warning which the system, driven by its own imperatives, has continually sought to downplay. Indeed, what distinguishes our time from earlier centuries is not so much the conservation of catastrophe, which has long been recognized, but rather the accelerated pace at which such destruction is now manifesting itself, i.e., what I am calling the accumulation of catastrophe. The desertification arising in pre-capitalist times, partly through human action, manifested itself over centuries, even millennia. Today changes in the land, the atmosphere, the oceans, indeed the entire life-support system of the earth, are the product of mere decades. If in the past, Darwin was struck that in a mere three centuries after European colonization, the ecology of the island of St. Helena had been destroyed to the point that it was reduced to “desert”—today, in only two generations, we have altered the biogeochemical processes of the entire planet.28The absence of a historical perspective on the conservation, even accumulation, of catastrophe is a major barrier to needed change in our time. Many environmentalists, including some who perceive themselves as being on the left, persist in believing that we can address our immense and growing ecological problems without altering our fundamental social-production relationships. All that is necessary in this view is the combined magic of green technology and green markets. Short-term fixes are presumed to be adequate solutions, while society remains on the same essential course as before. Indeed, the dominant perspective on ecology can be characterized, I believe, as consisting of three successive stages of denial: (1) the denial altogether of the planetary ecological crisis (or its human cause); (2) the denial that the ecological crisis is fundamentally due to the system of production in which we live, namely capitalism; and (3) the denial that capitalism is constitutionally incapable of overcoming this global ecological threat—with capital now being presented instead as the savior of the environment.The first stage of ecological denial is easy to understand. This is the form of denial represented by Exxon-Mobil. Such outright denial of the destructive consequences of their actions is the automatic response of corporations generally when faced with the prospect of environmental regulations, which would negatively affect their bottom lines. It is also the form of absolute denial promoted by climate-change denialists themselves, who categorically reject the reality of human agency in global climate change. The second stage of denial, a retreat from the first, is to admit there is a problem, while dissociating it from the larger socioeconomic system. The famous IPAT formula, i.e. Environmental Impact = Population x Consumption x Technology (which amounts to saying that these are the three factors behind our environmental problems/solutions), has been used by some to suggest that population growth, the consumption habits of most individuals, and inappropriate technology carry the totality of blame for environmental degradation. The answer then is sustainable population, sustainable consumption, and sustainable technology. This approach, though seemingly matter-of-fact, and deceptively radical, derives its acceptability for the vested interests from the fact that it generally serves to disguise the more fundamental reality of the treadmill of capitalist production itself.29 The third stage of denial, a last-ditch defense, and exhibiting a greater level of desperation on the part of the established order, is, I would argue, the most dangerous of all. It admits that the environmental crisis is wrapped up with the existence of capitalism, but argues that what we need is an entirely new kind of capitalism: variously called “sustainable capitalism,” “green capitalism,” “natural capitalism,” and “climate capitalism” by thinkers as various as Al Gore, Paul Hawken, Amory and L. Hunter Lovins, and Jonathon Porritt.30 The argument here varies but usually begins with the old trope that capitalism is the most efficient economic system possible—a form of “spontaneous order” arising from an invisible hand—and that the answer to ecological problems is to make it more efficient still by internalizing costs on the environment previously externalized by the system. Aside from the presumed magic of the market itself, and moral claims as to “the greening of corporations,” this is supposed to be achieved by means of a black box of technological wonders. Implicit in all such views is the notion that capitalism can be made sustainable, without altering its accumulation or economic growth imperative and without breaking with the dominant social relations. The exponential growth of the system ad infinitum is possible, we are told, while simultaneously generating a sustainable relation to the planet. This of course runs up against what Herman Daly has called the Impossibility Theorem: If the whole world were to have an ecological footprint the size of the United States we would need multiple planets.31 The idea that such a development process can persist permanently on a single planet (and indeed that we are not at this point already confronting earthly limits) is of course an exercise in delusion, bordering on belief in the supernatural. “Capitalism,” as the great environmental economist K. William Kapp once wrote, is “an economy of unpaid costs.”32 It can persist and even prosper only insofar as it is able to externalize its costs on the mass of the population and the surrounding environment. Whenever the destruction is too severe the system simply seeks to engineer another spatial fix. Yet, a planetary capitalism is from this standpoint a contradiction in terms: it means that there is nowhere finally to externalize the social and environmental costs of capitalist destruction (we cannot ship our toxic waste into outer space!), and no external resources to draw upon in the face of the enormous squandering of resources inherent to the system (we can’t solve our problems by mining the moon!). Market-based solutions to climate change, such as emissions trading, have been shown to promote profits, and to facilitate economic growth and financial wealth, while increasing carbon emissions. From an environmental standpoint, therefore, they are worse than nothing—since they stand in the way of effective action. Nor are the technologies most acceptable to the system (since not requiring changes in property relations) the answer. So-called “clean coal” or carbon capture and storage technologies are economically unfeasible and ecologically dubious, and serve mainly as an ideological justification for keeping coal-fired plants going. Worse still, are geoengineering schemes like dumping sulfur particles in the atmosphere or iron filings in the ocean (the first in order to deflect the sun’s rays, the second in order to promote algal growth to increase ocean absorption of carbon). These schemes carry with them the potential for even greater ecological disasters: in the first case, this could lead to a reduction of photosynthesis, in the second the expansion of dead zones. Remember the Sorcerer’s Apprentice!33 The potential for the accumulation of catastrophe on a truly planetary level as a result of geoengineering technology is so great that it would be absolute folly to proceed in this way—simply in order to avoid changes in the mode of production, i.e., a fundamental transformation of our way of life, property relations, and metabolism with nature. Science tells us that we are crossing planetary boundaries everywhere we look, from climate change, to ocean acidification, to species destruction, to freshwater shortages, to chemical pollution of air, water, soil, and humans. The latest warning sign is the advent of what is called “extreme weather”—a direct outgrowth of climate change. As Hansen says: “Global warming increases the intensity of droughts and heat waves, and thus the area of forest fires. However, because a warmer atmosphere holds more water vapor, global warming must also increase the intensity of the other extreme of the hydrologic cycle—meaning heavier rains, more extreme floods, and more intense storms driven by latent heat.” Scientists involved in the new area of climate-attribution science, where extreme weather events are examined for their climate signatures, are now arguing that we are rapidly approaching a situation where the proverbial “‘hundred-year’ flood” no longer occurs simply once a century, but every few years. Natural catastrophes are thus likely to become more severe and more frequent occurrences in the lives of all living beings. The hope of some scientists is that this will finally wake up humanity to its true danger.34 How are we to understand the challenge of the enormous accumulation of catastrophe, and the no less massive human action required to address this? In the 1930s John Maynard Keynes wrote an essay entitled “Economic Possibilities of Our Grandchildren,” aimed at defending capitalism in response to revolutionary social challenges then arising. Keynes argued that we should rely for at least a couple more generations on the convenient lie of the Smithian invisible hand—accepting greed as the basis of a spontaneous economic order. We should therefore continue the pretense that “fair is foul and foul is fair” for the sake of the greater accumulation of wealth in society that such an approach would bring. Eventually, in the time of our “grandchildren”—maybe a “hundred years” hence (i.e., by the early 2030s)—Keynes assumed, the added wealth created by these means would be great enough that we could begin to tell the truth: that foul is foul and fair is fair. It would then be necessary for humanity to address the enormous inequalities and injustices produced by the system, engaging in a full-scale redistribution of wealth, and a radical transformation of the ends of production.35 Yet, the continued pursuit of Keynes’s convenient lie over the last eight decades has led to a world far more polarized and beset with contradictions than he could have foreseen. It is a world prey to the enormous unintended consequences of accumulation without limits: namely, global economic stagnation, financial crisis, and planetary ecological destruction. Keynes, though aware of some of the negative economic aspects of capitalist production, had no real understanding of the ecological perils—of which scientists had already long been warning. Today these perils are impossible to overlook. Faced with impending ecological catastrophe, it is more necessary than ever to abandon Keynes’s convenient lie and espouse the truth: that foul is foul and fair is fair. Capitalism, the society of “après moi le déluge!” is a system that fouls its own nest—both the human-social conditions and the wider natural environment on which it depends. The accumulation of capital is at the same time accumulation of catastrophe, not only for a majority of the world’s people, but living species generally. Hence, nothing is fairer—more just, more beautiful, and more necessary—today than the struggle to overthrow the regime of capital and to create a system of substantive equality and sustainable human development; a socialism for the twenty-first century.

#### Materialist explanations of institutionalized capitalist racism through objective measurements like “life chances” are empirically verified and key to generate material change - inducing action through argument. Their consciousness-based explanation ends up blaming abstract groups for “thinking racism into existence because of irrational hatred” - that justifies the status quo, not revolutionary action.

WILLIAMS 2K5

[Christopher j., in defense of materialism: a critique of afrocentric ontology, PhD Candidate, Sociology, York university, institute of race relations, vol 47 1, Race and Class]

The picture becomes even more confounding when concepts rooted¶ in materialist analyses of the social are appropriated and reinterpreted¶ within an idealist Afrocentric framework. The concept of life chances,¶ for example, has long been understood in unambiguously structural¶ terms by a number of leading sociologists. Weber, in his essay entitled¶ ‘Class, status, party’, wrote about life chances as indicative of classes;¶ that is, he considered people with similar life chances as the constituent¶ elements of a social class. In the course of building upon the work of¶ Weber, Ralph Dahrendorf, who has formulated the most thorough¶ sociological explication of life chances, explains that ‘life chances are¶ opportunities for individual growth, for the realization of talents,¶ wishes and hopes, and these opportunities are provided by social conditions’.¶ 7 Similarly, Peter M. Blau has demonstrated how life chances¶ are shaped by ascribed characteristics, occupational structures and¶ transformations at the level of macroeconomics.8 Perspectives on life¶ chances such as these have not only guided contemporary research¶ on structural violence under late capitalism, but also contain insights¶ that ought to be of interest to people of African descent, for the¶ power of racism is, in large measure, the power to truncate the life¶ chances of oppressed groups. The US black–white gap in life expectancy¶ is one of the more obvious manifestations of this phenomenon.¶ From an Afrocentric perspective, however, prevailing structural¶ arrangements and asymmetrical intergroup power relations are less¶ important determinants of life chances than individual consciousness.¶ As Harris explains:¶ While not anti-materialistic, an Afrocentric orientation is one which¶ asserts that consciousness determines being. Consciousness in this¶ sense means the way an individual (or a people) thinks about relationships¶ with self, others, with nature, and with some superior¶ idea or Being . . . For example, the ancient Egyptian assertion,¶ ‘Man Know Thy Self,’ indicates that the way one sees (thinks about¶ and conceptualizes) the world precedes and determines life chances¶ more so than exposure to or deprivation from various material¶ conditions.9¶ Presumably, then, if the life chances of African-Americans undergo a¶ sharp decline over the next two decades, this development will be the¶ consequence of an aggregate – and probably inexplicable – degradation¶ of consciousness rather than, say, the intensification of structural disadvantage.¶ Notwithstanding Harris’s disclaimer, this conception of¶ life chances is anti-materialistic: any other description stretches the limits of plausibility. The proposition that variations in life chances are reducible to variations in consciousness dovetails neatly with mainstream¶ pop psychology ‘mind over matter’ rhetoric, which has the¶ effect of discouraging critiques of the racial-economic status quo. To¶ wit: if being is determined by consciousness, then how reasonable is¶ it to put forth institutional racism as an explanation of the unacceptably¶ high levels of infant mortality among African-Americans? The¶ point is that, although it would be a mistake to contend that nonstructural¶ influences on life chances are non-existent, it is far more¶ egregious to sever the concept of life chances from the same materialist¶ ontology that gives it full meaning. Not to recognise this is to unwittingly¶ formulate a discourse of demobilisation rather than radicalisation.

## 2NC

### AT SSD = No Identity

#### Switch-side debate fosters tolerance and empathy toward others --- their framework inevitably degrades into dogmatism and bigotry

**Muir ‘93**

(Star, Professor of Communication – George Mason U., “A Defense of the Ethics of Contemporary Debate”, *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, Vol. 26, No. 4, p. 288-9)

The role of switch-side debate is especially important in the oral defense of arguments that foster tolerance without accruing the moral complications of acting on such beliefs. The forum is therefore unique in providing debaters with attitudes of tolerance without committing them to active moral irresponsibility. As Freeley notes, debaters are indeed exposed to a multivalued world, both within and between the sides of a given topic. Yet this exposure hardly commits them to such "mistaken" values. In this view, the divorce of the game from the "real world" can be seen as a means of gaining perspective without obligating students to validate their hypothetical value structure through immoral actions.'s Values clarification, Stewart is correct in pointing out, does not mean that no values are developed. Two very important values— tolerance and fairness—inhere to a significant degree in the ethics of switch-side debate. A second point about the charge of relativism is that tolerance is related to the development of reasoned moral viewpoints. The willingness to recognize the existence of other views, and to grant alternative positions a degree of credibility, is a value fostered by switch-side debate: Alternately debating both sides of the same question . . . inculcates a deep-seated attitude of tolerance toward differing points of view. To be forced to debate only one side leads to an ego-identification with that side. , . . The other side in contrast is seen only as something to be discredited. Arguing as persuasively as one can for completely opposing views is one way of giving recognition to the idea that a strong case can generally be made for the views of earnest and intelligent men, however such views may clash with one's own. . . .Promoting this kind of tolerance is perhaps one of the greatest benefits debating both sides has to offer. 5' The activity should encourage debating both sides of a topic, reasons Thompson, because debaters are "more likely to realize that propositions are bilateral. It is those who fail to recognize this fact who become intolerant, dogmatic, and bigoted.""\* While Theodore Roosevelt can hardly be said to be advocating bigotry, his efforts to turn out advocates convinced of their rightness is not a position imbued with tolerance.

### 2NC State Good - Racism

#### Blanket rejection of state policy prevents solutions over environmental justice

Fan 06

(Mei-Fang, Professor of Public Administration and Institute of Public Policy – Tamkang University “Environmental Justice and Nuclear Waste Conflicts in Taiwan,” Environmental Politics, Vol. 15, No. 3, p. 417 – 434, June)

It is necessary to rethink the multiple conceptions of environmental justice articulated by the Yami and Taiwanese groups. This section focuses on the questions of how we might respond to differing ways of understanding environmental justice, deal with the divisions within a multicultural society and formulate environmental policy regarding nuclear waste dilemmas. The Yami professional and teenage student groups tended to stress the preservation of a liveable environment for future generations and regarded it as the core element of the environmental justice movement and the basis for the Yami’s opposition to nuclear waste. Instead, for most of the Taiwanese participants, the Yami’s anti-nuclear movement did not exactly correspond to the claims of environmental justice. Those Taiwanese participants who hold utilitarian views considered that the Yami anti-nuclear waste movement involved political consideration, self-interest and the attempt to obtain benefits or celebrity. The gap between the Yami and Taiwanese groups and the lack of mutual understanding and communication between them are significant. The Yami groups expressed their doubts as to whether the Taiwanese people would treat the tribesmen sincerely as partners in dealing with environmental problems, while the Taiwanese participants seemed to view the Yami as insular. A growing number of environmental ethicists have tried to rethink the problem of what practical effect environmental ethics has had on the formation of environmental policy. Contrary to a monistic approach, moral pluralism as a practical philosophy allows a form of agreement on real cases in which agreement on the general formulation of moral principles is not essential. Practical philosophy seeks the integration of multiple values and tries to reduce the distance between disputants by finding a general policy direction that can achieve greater consensus. It searches for workable solutions to specific problems or a range of actions that are morally permissible or acceptable to a wide range of worldviews (Norton, 1995: 129– 33). The multiple conceptions of environmental justice articulated by the Yami and Taiwanese groups in the context of nuclear waste controversies provide support for a pluralistic account of environmental values rather than a monistic philosophical stance. A foundational approach to ethics that requires the application of a single theory functionally equivalent to truth fails to take a variety of conflicting moral insights into account and limits alternatives to nuclear waste management. In contrast, pragmatism represents an engagement with the actual problems in the specific historical and social context. Environmental pragmatism draws upon the pragmatist philosophical and political tradition in American thought, advocating a serious inquiry into the practical merits of moral pluralism (Light & Katz, 1996). The American philosophical school, represented mainly in the late 19th- and early 20thcentury writings of Charles Peirce, William James and John Dewey is marked most notably by its anti-foundational character that denies the existence of ‘a priori or self-justifying ‘‘truths’’ and moral absolutes’ (Minteer & Manning, 1999: 193). For Light (1996), there is much that we do agree on that has not been put into environmental policy or communicated to the public effectively. From the metaphilosophical perspective, what environmental pragmatists agree on is that the truth of any particular theoretical framework is not always fundamental for specific environmental problems and the ‘appropriateness of any one theory in a particular case is contingent on historical, cultural, social and resource conditions’. Environmental pragmatism chooses the approach that is most appropriate for purposes of environmental practice regardless of its theoretical origin (Light, 1996: 172, 177). Considering the multiple values held by the Yami and Taiwanese groups in the nuclear waste disputes, abstract moral norms provided by environmental ethicists do not appear to resolve the practical problems faced by the local residents on Orchid Island. Instead of asking environmental ethicists to give up their debates about non-anthropocentric natural value, environmental pragmatism endorses a pluralism that acknowledges the possible necessity of sometimes using the anthropocentric description of the value of nature to help support a morally responsible policy (Light, 2004). Furthermore, the pragmatists admit that our understandings and concepts are fallible, and that experience can at any time reveal our beliefs or the meaning of an idea as false. Environmental pragmatism recognises the importance of many diverse individuals, experiences and concepts coming together to offer insights into actual problems in the public sphere (Parker, 1996). A growing body of research has demonstrated the validity of a pragmatic approach to specific environmental and social issues, including the cases of policymaking for leaded gasoline (Thomson, 2003), forest resource management (Castle, 1996), animal welfare and hunting (Light, 2004). Environmental pragmatism, representing a democratic respect for diverse public values and ethical positions regarding the environment, is relevant to the multiple understandings

### AT Ceding responsibility bad

#### Additionally, connecting one’s personal experience to global, political problems has unique benefits of empowerment and success

Yeo 11

Yeo (Assistant Professor of Politics at the Catholic University of America) 11

(Andrew, Activists, Alliances, and Anti-U.S. Base Protests, Cambridge University Press, pg 196-7)

In the previous section, 1 covered several policy implications and prescriptions for U.S. overseas basing strategy. What insights and lessons can be drawn for anti‑base movements? I offer four sets of recommendations for activists regarding anti‑base movement strategy and advocacy. The first suggestion stems directly from the security consensus framework: when possible, activists should form ties with political elites. As discussed in the introductory chapter, U.S. base policies are ultimately decided by government officials. Therefore, anti‑base movements gain greater leverage and influence on basing policy outcomes when they form ties with key elites. This was certainly the case with successful anti‑base movements such as the Anti‑Treaty Movement in the Philippines and No Bases Coalition in Ecuador. Although not included in this volume, ties qeen Puerto Rican anti‑base activists and several U.S. congressional repre­ utatives helped activists shut down Roosevelt Roads Naval Station in Vieques it, Loo‑i. The support of several prominent U.S. political figures such as Hillary Clinton and Jesse Jackson, and the direct involvement of U.S. representatives 11ch as Nydia M. Velasquez and Luis V. Gutierrez, increased publicity and political leverage for the Vieques movement.57 Encouraging anti‑base movements to form ties with sympathetic elites seems u'f‑evident. Yet, one might find surprising the level of resistance to this suggestion by some activists. Ties to political elites raise the specter of co‑optation. The lack of trust in politicians, the political establishment, or more generally formal politics often stems from activists' own experience and interaction with government officials over the course of several movement episodes. This attitude was expressed by several anti‑base activists in South Korea, Japan, and even the Philippines. Activists in \ticeura also faced heated discussions over strategy: Should they maintain support for radical left parties? At the local level, should movement leaders move from informal to more formal avenues of politics? Although the wariness of movements in engaging formal political actors is understandable, research across several anti‑base movement episodes suggests that movements that form alliances with political elites and engage base politics through both formal and informal channels tend to have a greater impact on basing policy outcomes.

### AT You get Ground

#### 3) Echo Chamber DA — lack of structured clash makes debate into an echo chamber. That prevents any knowledge gaining and turns their education claims

Talisse 5—Professor of Philosophy @Vandy

Robert, *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, Deliberativist responses to activist challenges, 31(4) p. 429-431

The argument thus far might appear to turn exclusively upon different conceptions of what reasonableness entails. The deliberativist view I have sketched holds that reasonableness involves some degree of what we may call epistemic modesty. On this view, the reasonable citizen seeks to have her beliefs reﬂect the best available reasons, and so she enters into public discourse as a way of testing her views against the objections and questions of those who disagree; hence she implicitly holds that her present view is open to reasonable critique and that others who hold opposing views may be able to offer justiﬁcations for their views that are at least as strong as her reasons for her own. Thus any mode of politics that presumes that discourse is extraneous to questions of justice and justiﬁcation is unreasonable. The activist sees no reason to accept this. Reasonableness for the activist consists in the ability to act on reasons that upon due reﬂection seem adequate to underwrite action; discussion with those who disagree need not be involved. According to the activist, there are certain cases in which he does in fact know the truth about what justice requires and in which there is no room for reasoned objection. Under such conditions, the deliberativist’s demand for discussion can only obstruct justice; it is therefore irrational. It may seem that we have reached an impasse. However, there is a further line of criticism that the activist must face. To the activist’s view that at least in certain situations he may reasonably decline to engage with persons he disagrees with (107), the deliberative democrat can raise the phenomenon that Cass Sunstein has called ‘group polarization’ (Sunstein, 2003; 2001a: ch. 3; 2001b: ch. 1). To explain: consider that political activists cannot eschew deliberation altogether; they often engage in rallies, demonstrations, teach-ins, workshops, and other activities in which they are called to make public the case for their views. Activists also must engage in deliberation among themselves when deciding strategy. Political movements must be organized, hence those involved must decide upon targets, methods, and tactics; they must also decide upon the content of their pamphlets and the precise messages they most wish to convey to the press. Often the audience in both of these deliberative contexts will be a self-selected and sympathetic group of like-minded activists. Group polarization is a well-documented phenomenon that has ‘been found all over the world and in many diverse tasks’; it means that ‘members of a deliberating group predictably move towards a more extreme point in the direction indicated by the members’ predeliberation tendencies’ (Sunstein, 2003: 81–2). Importantly, in groups that ‘engage in repeated discussions’ over time, the polarization is even more pronounced (2003: 86 Hence discussion in a small but devoted activist enclave that meets regularly to strategize and protest ‘should produce a situation in which individuals hold positions more extreme than those of any individual member before the series of deliberations began’ (ibid.) 17 The fact of group polarization is relevant to our discussion because the activist has proposed that he may reasonably decline to engage in discussion with those with whom he disagrees in cases in which the requirements of justice are so clear that he can be conﬁdent that he has the truth. Group polarization suggests that deliberatively confronting those with whom we disagree is essential even when we have the truth. For even if we have the truth, if we do not engage opposing views, but instead deliberate only with those with whom we agree, our view will shift progressively to a more extreme point, and thus we lose the truth. In order to avoid polarization, deliberation must take place within heterogeneous ‘argument pools’ (Sunstein, 2003: 93). This of course does not mean that there should be no groups devoted to the achievement of some common political goal; it rather suggests that engagement with those with whom one disagrees is essential to the proper pursuit of justice. Insofar as the activist denies this, he is unreasonable.

### AT Young

#### Young is wrong—deliberation is better than activism

Talisse 2005

(Robert, philosophy professor, Vanderbilt, “Deliberativist responses to activist challenges," Philosophy & Social Criticism 31.4 - gendered language in this article refers to arguments made by two specific individuals in an article by Iris Young)

Accordingly, Young’s dialectic between the deliberativist and the activist is of crucial import to the theorist of deliberative democracy, and the challenges she poses need to be addressed. I shall argue in this article that the rejoinders Young develops on behalf of the activist to deliberativist criticisms of activism are insufficient, and that the deliberativist can muster stronger responses to activist challenges to deliberative democracy than those suggested by Young.11 My aspiration, then, is not to resolve the tension between activism and deliberativism, but to bolster the position of the deliberative democrat in the dialectic to which Young has called our attention; in this way, the tension between the two visions of democratic citizenship is punctuated and thus more thoroughly problematized for both the deliberativist and the activist. Hence my arguments constitute a call not simply for caution among deliberative democrats, but for further critical engagement between deliberativists and activists. Along the way, I hope to underscore elements of the deliberative democrat’s position that are insufficiently theorized in Young’s presentation.

### AT Perm do both

#### Zero risk of a net benefit or aff sovlency

Solt ‘04

(Roger, Debate Coach – U. Kentucky, “Debate’s Culture of Narcissism”, Contemporary Argumentation and Debate, Vol. 25, p. 46)

**In a**nother **early formulation, critical argument was deemed preferable because, unlike arguments resting on** the illusory notion of **policy fiat, it could have a real world** political **impact. This approach seems to have waned** in recent years, and it has done so **for good reason**. The idea of policy **fiat is sometimes dismissed as utopian, but the notion that a winning ballot in a college debate round could trigger a world-transforming social movement borders on megalomania**. Beyond college debate’s few hundred active participants, **some fraction of America**’s hundreds of millions **probably has a vague intimation that** something like **college debate exists**. (They do, after all, watch “The Apprentice.”) **But they are certainly not attentive to its outcomes**, no newspaper reports debate results (“kritik of capitalism 3, capitalism 1”), nor do they understand its intricacies. **And those relative few** who do know something about debate **know that it is a** competitive **game and that a** judge’s **ballot does not signify** conviction **or ideological conversion** (as those of use who have voted for arguments like “nuclear war good” can readily attest.) **People do not make fundamental** moral and political **judgments based on individual** debate **rounds**; nor should they. **Reflective people** surely **have better bases for their beliefs than** the outcomes of **fast, short, competitive debates**.

#### Perm creates backlash, undermining any attempt at change

Atchison and Panetta, 09

(Jarrod Atchison, Phd Rhetoric University of Georgia, Assistant Professor and Director of debate at Wake Forest University, and Edward Panetta, Phd Rhetoric Associate Professor University of Pitt and Director of Debate at Georgia, Intercollegiate Debate and Speech Communication, Historical Developments and Issues for the Future, “Intercollegiate Debate and Speech Communication: Issues for the Future,” The Sage Handbook of Rhetorical Studies, Lunsford, Andrea, ed. (Los Angeles: Sage Publications Inc., 2009)

Competition has been a critical component of the interest in intercollegiate debate from the beginning, and it does not help further the goals of the debate community to dismiss competition in the name of community change. The larger problem with locating the "debate as activism" perspective within the competitive framework is that it overlooks the communal nature of the community problem. If each individual debate is a decision about how the debate community should approach a problem, then the losing debaters become collateral damage in the activist strategy dedicated toward creating community change. One frustrating example of this type of argument might include a judge voting for an activist team in an effort to help them reach elimination rounds to generate a community discussion about the problem. Under this scenario, the losing team serves as a sacrificial lamb on the altar of community change.¶ Downplaying the important role of competition and treating opponents as scapegoats for the failures of the community may increase the profile of the winning team and the community problem, but it does little to generate the critical coalitions necessary to address the community problem, because the competitive focus encourages teams to concentrate on how to beat the strategy with little regard for addressing the community problem. There is no role for competition when a judge decides that it is important to accentuate the publicity of a community problem. An extreme example might include a team arguing that their opponents' academic institution had a legacy of civil rights abuses and that the judge should not vote for them because that would be a community endorsement of a problematic institution. This scenario is a bit more outlandish but not unreasonable if one assumes mat each debate should be about what is best for promoting solutions to diversity problems in the debate community.

## 1NR

### Link Debate

#### Finishing Williams

Presumably, then, if the life chances of African-Americans undergo a¶ sharp decline over the next two decades, this development will be the¶ consequence of an aggregate – and probably inexplicable – degradation¶ of consciousness rather than, say, the intensification of structural disadvantage.¶ Notwithstanding Harris’s disclaimer, this conception of¶ life chances is anti-materialistic: any other description stretches the limits of plausibility. The proposition that variations in life chances are reducible to variations in consciousness dovetails neatly with mainstream¶ pop psychology ‘mind over matter’ rhetoric, which has the¶ effect of discouraging critiques of the racial-economic status quo. To¶ wit: if being is determined by consciousness, then how reasonable is¶ it to put forth institutional racism as an explanation of the unacceptably¶ high levels of infant mortality among African-Americans? The¶ point is that, although it would be a mistake to contend that nonstructural¶ influences on life chances are non-existent, it is far more¶ egregious to sever the concept of life chances from the same materialist¶ ontology that gives it full meaning. Not to recognise this is to unwittingly¶ formulate a discourse of demobilisation rather than radicalisation.

### No Solvency

#### Our materialist reading of history impunes their solvency claims – their anti-racist project can’t achieve social or ontological change.

WILLIAMS 2K5

[Christopher j., in defense of materialism: a critique of afrocentric ontology, PhD Candidate, Sociology, York university, institute of race relations, vol 47 1, Race and Class]

In addition to its questionability on ontological grounds, the Afrocentric¶ understanding of racism as a primarily cultural phenomenon¶ reveals itself as an insufficient point of departure for the development¶ of contemporary anti-racist strategies. While one can readily acknowledge¶ the relevance of ‘positive images’ and ‘language strategies’ in the¶ context of efforts to mitigate racism, measures such as these are very¶ limited by the polymorphous nature of racist ideology itself, which¶ features, as its common threads, (1) the degradation of the Other, and¶ (2) the sanctification of the status quo. The remaining threads – those¶ created in service of the degradation-sanctification imperative – vary¶ considerably from time to time and place to place and, as such, exhibit¶ a hydra-like ability to effect impressive self-regeneration processes.¶ Consequently, Africans go from heathens to biologically inferior¶ beings, to the bearers of cultural pathology, depending, in part, on¶ the efficacy of cultural/intellectual anti-racist challenges. The point,¶ however, is that although the explanatory details (reference to religion,¶ biology or culture) change, the general assertion of African inferiority¶ remains. This is why Stephen Steinberg, a sociologist who works in¶ accordance with a materialist perspective, is correct in arguing that¶ ‘ideas have little ‘‘life of their own’’ independent of the social structures¶ in which they are embedded. It will be possible to dispel myths about¶ race and ethnicity only when the conditions that produce and nourish¶ these myths are changed.’ 32 The failure to work towards the substantive¶ transformation of these conditions in favour of attacking racist¶ ideas per se results in an atrophied anti-racist project that has some¶ trappings of radicalism, but none of its true promise. Against this, an¶ effective Afrocentric approach to anti-racism would be heavily¶ informed by the position of Leith Mullings:¶ While ideas can act as a material force and the struggle for power¶ involves the struggle for interpretation, white supremacy, as we all¶ know, is not merely a cultural or literary project. As we are reminded¶ every day – by the hundreds of thousands of homeless, unemployed¶ African Americans, by nearly six in ten African American children¶ growing up in poverty, by every African American imprisoned¶ and executed by the state, by the young men shot down in the¶ flower of their youth, by all our assassinated heroes – at the foundation¶ of racism is a system of savagely unequal economic and political¶ relations.33

### 2NC Link Filter

#### Only foregrounding materialism can adequately confront the real effects of ontologically and socially grounded racisms – the aff’s rejection of this materialism should itself be rejected.

WILLIAMS 2K5

[Christopher j., in defense of materialism: a critique of afrocentric ontology, PhD Candidate, Sociology, York university, institute of race relations, vol 47 1, Race and Class]

Debates about ontology are often regarded as purely academic, but, as¶ I have attempted to demonstrate, the connection between ontology,¶ paradigm formation and praxis has important consequences for life¶ beyond the ivory tower. Although there is almost nothing insightful¶ or revolutionary about the Afrocentric rejection of materialism, it is¶ profound in certain ways: profoundly untrue to the sociological concept¶ of life chances, which, in its non-bastardised form, is capable of¶ guiding critical social research; profoundly consonant with the dominant¶ view that critiques of capitalism are hopelessly wrongheaded; profoundly¶ sanguine in its assumption that far-reaching shifts in African-¶ American culture can occur while the broader structural context¶ remains unchanged; profoundly compatible with neo-conservative¶ platitudes about cultural pathology among African-Americans, and¶ so on. What is especially ironic is that some of the same people who¶ were involved in the concrete struggles of the 1960s now, as Afrocentric¶ scholars, struggle to be above the concrete, all in the name of distancing¶ their paradigm from materialism.¶ Given the harsh materiality of inadequate food, substandard¶ housing, underfunded schools, chronic unemployment, police truncheons¶ and bullets, inaccessible health care, prison cells, and so forth,¶ Afrocentricity will not speak fully to the lived experiences of people¶ of African descent until the ‘materialism and Afrocentricity do not¶ mix’ position is abandoned. Enforcing the putative purity of the paradigm¶ by espousing the view that consciousness determines being is¶ an effective boundary maintenance strategy; it keeps the materialist¶ demons at bay, but does little to challenge relations of dominance¶ structured along the axes of race, class and gender. Furthermore, the¶ impact of cultural struggle is bound to be negligible unless it occurs¶ in conjunction with struggles that are political, economic and, if necessary,¶ armed; this point has some strong affinities with Amilcar Cabral’s¶ position concerning the multiple modes of resistance that may be effectuated¶ by people working to challenge external domination.34 And,¶ finally, notwithstanding our opposition to many of the statements¶ put forth by Afrocentrists, we are in complete agreement with Ama¶ Mazama’s contention that ‘the ultimate test will be our praxis’.35 The¶ ability of this praxis to bring about a just society will be greatly¶ enhanced if the rejection of materialism is rejected.

### Perm

#### Perm fails - our alternative cannot succeed without radically reorienting social organization —the system will re-articulate any gains to protect profit accumulation, preventing future revolutionary potential. zero-sum risk of the extinction da.

Meszaros 8

Istvan Meszaros, Professor at the University of Sussex, “The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time.” P47-48,

Thus, within the framework of the existing socioeconomic system a multiplicity of potentially dialectical interconnections are reproduced in the form of perverse practical dualisms, dichotomies, and antinomies, reducing human beings to a reified condition (whereby they are brought to a common denominator with, and become replaceable by, "locomotives" and other machines) and to the ignominious status of "time's carcase." And since the possibility of practically manifesting and realizing the inherent worth and human specificity of the individuals through their essential productive activity is blocked off as a result of this process of alienating reduction (which makes "one man during an hour worth just as much as another man"), value as such becomes an extremely problematical concept. For, in the interest of capitalist profit- ability, not only can there be no room left for the actualization of the individuals' specific worth but, worse still, counter-value must unceremoniously prevail over value and assert its absolute domination as the one and only admissible practical value-relation. The alternative socialist accountancy cannot prevail unless it succeeds in radically reorienting the process of societal reproduction in its entirety by breaking the tyranny of capital's dehumanizing time imperative. The fundamental categories of the social reproduction process, as inherent in the vital first-order mediations of a sustainable dialectical interaction between humanity and nature on an indefinite historical timescale, have been subverted in the course of development, especially in the last three centuries under the fetishistic imperatives of capital's social metabolic control. Thus the all-important achievement of humanity in the form of potentially emancipatory free time, embodied in society's productively expanding surplus-labor\_ which happens to be both the precondition as well as the promising storehouse of all future advancement, once extricated from its alienating capitalist integument-has been forced into the ultimately suffocating straitjacket of surplus-value under the corollary imperative of reducing necessary labor-time to the minimum, so as to be managed by the system's not only dehumanizing but also in historical terms increasingly more anachronistic time accountancy

# Round 5 v Concorida

## 1NC

### 1

#### 1) Interpretation: The ballot is to determine if the enactment of a topical plan is better than the status quo or a competitive advocacy

#### 2) Violation:

#### A) “Resolved” implies a policy or legislative decision – means they must be resolved about a future federal government policy

Jeff Parcher, former debate coach at Georgetown, Feb 2001 http://www.ndtceda.com/archives/200102/0790.html

Pardon me if I turn to a source besides Bill. American Heritage Dictionary: Resolve: 1. To make a firm decision about. 2. To decide or express by formal vote. 3. To separate something into constiutent parts See Syns at \*analyze\* (emphasis in orginal) 4. Find a solution to. See Syns at \*Solve\* (emphasis in original) 5. To dispel: resolve a doubt. - n 1. Firmness of purpose; resolution. 2. A determination or decision. (2) The very nature of the word "resolution" makes it a question. American Heritage: A course of action determined or decided on. A formal statement of a decision, as by a legislature. (3) The resolution is obviously a question. Any other conclusion is utterly inconceivable. Why? Context. The debate community empowers a topic committee to write a topic for ALTERNATE side debating. The committee is not a random group of people coming together to "reserve" themselves about some issue. There is context - they are empowered by a community to do something. In their deliberations, the topic community attempts to craft a resolution which can be ANSWERED in either direction. They focus on issues like ground and fairness because they know the resolution will serve as the basis for debate which will be resolved by determining the policy desirablility of that resolution. That's not only what they do, but it's what we REQUIRE them to do. We don't just send the topic committee somewhere to adopt their own group resolution. It's not the end point of a resolution adopted by a body - it's the preliminary wording of a resolution sent to others to be answered or decided upon. (4) Further context: the word resolved is used to emphasis the fact that it's policy debate. Resolved comes from the adoption of resolutions by legislative bodies. A resolution is either adopted or it is not. It's a question before a legislative body. Should this statement be adopted or not. (5) The very terms 'affirmative' and 'negative' support my view. One affirms a resolution.

#### B) USFG is the national government in DC.

Encarta Online Encyclopedia, 2k

(http://encarta.msn.com)

“The federal government **of the U**nited **S**tates **is centered in** Washington **DC”**

#### C) Should means there is a practical reason for action

WordNet in ‘97

Princeton University, 1.6

**Should** v 1 : be expected to: “Parties should be fun” 2 : **expresses an** emotional**, practical,** or other **reason for doing something:** “You had better put on warm clothes”; “You should call your mother-in-law”; *“The State ought to repair bridges*”[syn**:** had better, ought]

#### 3) Vote Negative:

#### Limits

#### They’re necessary to give discussions direction and closure

**Tonn 05**

(Mari Boor, Professor of Communication – University of Maryland, “Taking Conversation, Dialogue, and Therapy Public”, *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, Vol. 8, Issue 3, Fall)

Second, whereas Schudson focuses largely on ways a conversational model for democracy may mute an individual's voice in crafting a resolution on a given question at a given time, I draw upon insights of Dana L. Cloud and others to consider ways in which a therapeutic, conversational approach to public problems can stymie productive, collective action in two respects.17 First, because conversation has no clearly defined goal, a public conversation may engender inertia as participants become mired in repeated airings of personal experiences without a mechanism to lend such expressions direction and closure. As Freeman aptly notes, although "[u]nstructured groups may be very effective in getting [people] to talk about their lives[,] they aren't very good for getting things done. Unless their mode of operation changes, groups flounder at the point where people tire of 'just talking.'"18 Second, because the therapeutic bent of much public conversation locates social ills and remedies within individuals or dynamics of interpersonal relationships, public conversations and dialogues risk becoming substitutes for policy formation necessary to correct structural dimensions of social problems. In mimicking the emphasis on the individual in therapy, Cloud warns, the therapeutic rhetoric of "healing, consolation, and adaptation or adjustment" tends to "encourage citizens to perceive political issues, conflicts, and inequities as personal failures subject to personal amelioration."19

#### Limited topic of discussion that provides for equitable ground is key to productive inculcation of decision-making and advocacy skills

Steinberg & Freeley 8

\*Austin J. Freeley is a Boston based attorney who focuses on criminal, personal injury and civil rights law, AND \*\*David L. Steinberg , Lecturer of Communication Studies @ U Miami, Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making pp45-

Debate is a means of settling differences, so there must be a difference of opinion or a conflict of interest before there can be a debate. If everyone is in agreement on a tact or value or policy, there is no need for debate: the matter can be settled by unanimous consent. Thus, for example, it would be pointless to attempt to debate "Resolved: That two plus two equals four," because there is simply no controversy about this statement. (Controversy is an essential prerequisite of debate. Where there is no clash of ideas, proposals, interests, or expressed positions on issues, there is no debate. In addition, debate cannot produce effective decisions without clear identification of a question or questions to be answered. For example, general argument may occur about the broad topic of illegal immigration. How many illegal immigrants are in the United States? What is the impact of illegal immigration and immigrants on our economy? What is their impact on our communities? Do they commit crimes? Do they take jobs from American workers? Do they pay taxes? Do they require social services? Is it a problem that some do not speak English? Is it the responsibility of employers to discourage illegal immigration by not hiring undocumented workers? Should they have the opportunity- to gain citizenship? Docs illegal immigration pose a security threat to our country? Do illegal immigrants do work that American workers are unwilling to do? Are their rights as workers and as human beings at risk due to their status? Are they abused by employers, law enforcement, housing, and businesses? I low are their families impacted by their status? What is the moral and philosophical obligation of a nation state to maintain its borders? Should we build a wall on the Mexican border, establish a national identification can!, or enforce existing laws against employers? Should we invite immigrants to become U.S. citizens? Surely you can think of many more concerns to be addressed by a conversation about the topic area of illegal immigration. Participation in this "debate" is likely to be emotional and intense. However, it is not likely to be productive or useful without focus on a particular question and identification of a line demarcating sides in the controversy. To be discussed and resolved effectively, controversies must be stated clearly. Vague understanding results in unfocused deliberation and poor decisions, frustration, and emotional distress, as evidenced by the failure of the United States Congress to make progress on the immigration debate during the summer of 2007. Someone disturbed by the problem of the growing underclass of poorly educated, socially disenfranchised youths might observe, "Public schools are doing a terrible job! They are overcrowded, and many teachers are poorly qualified in their subject areas. Even the best teachers can do little more than struggle to maintain order in their classrooms." That same concerned citizen, facing a complex range of issues, might arrive at an unhelpful decision, such as "We ought to do something about this" or. worse. "It's too complicated a problem to deal with." Groups of concerned citizens worried about the state of public education could join together to express their frustrations, anger, disillusionment, and emotions regarding the schools, but without a focus for their discussions, they could easily agree about the sorry state of education without finding points of clarity or potential solutions. A gripe session would follow. But if a precise question is posed—such as "What can be done to improve public education?"—then a more profitable area of discussion is opened up simply by placing a focus on the search for a concrete solution step. One or more judgments can be phrased in the form of debate propositions, motions for parliamentary debate, or bills for legislative assemblies. The statements "Resolved: That the federal government should implement a program of charter schools in at-risk communities" and "Resolved: That the state of Florida should adopt a school voucher program" more clearly identify specific ways of dealing with educational problems in a manageable form, suitable for debate. They provide specific policies to be investigated and aid discussants in identifying points of difference. To have a productive debate, which facilitates effective decision making by directing and placing limits on the decision to be made, the basis for argument should be clearly defined. If we merely talk about "homelessness" or "abortion" or "crime'\* or "global warming" we are likely to have an interesting discussion but not to establish profitable basis for argument. For example, the statement "Resolved: That the pen is mightier than the sword" is debatable, yet fails to provide much basis for clear argumentation. If we take this statement to mean that the written word is more effective than physical force for some purposes, we can identify a problem area: the comparative effectiveness of writing or physical force for a specific purpose. Although we now have a general subject, we have not yet stated a problem. It is still too broad, too loosely worded to promote well-organized argument. What sort of writing are we concerned with—poems, novels, government documents, website development, advertising, or what? What does "effectiveness" mean in this context? What kind of physical force is being compared—fists, dueling swords, bazookas, nuclear weapons, or what? A more specific question might be. "Would a mutual defense treaty or a visit by our fleet be more effective in assuring Liurania of our support in a certain crisis?" The basis for argument could be phrased in a debate proposition such as "Resolved: That the United States should enter into a mutual defense treatv with Laurania." Negative advocates might oppose this proposition by arguing that fleet maneuvers would be a better solution. This is not to say that debates should completely avoid creative interpretation of the controversy by advocates, or that good debates cannot occur over competing interpretations of the controversy; in fact, these sorts of debates may be very engaging. The point is that debate is best facilitated by the guidance provided by focus on a particular point of difference, which will be outlined in the following discussion.

#### Stasis

#### Effective deliberation requires predictable points of stasis – its key to overcome politically debilitating self-obsession

Roberts-Miller 03

(Patricia Roberts-Miller is Associate Professor of Rhetoric at the University of Texas "Fighting Without Hatred: Hannah Arendt’s Agonistic Rhetoric" JAC 22.2 2003)

Totalitarianism and the Competitive Space of Agonism Arendt is probably most famous for her analysis of totalitarianism (especially her The Origins of Totalitarianism andEichmann in Jerusa¬lem), but the recent attention has been on her criticism of mass culture (The Human Condition). Arendt's main criticism of the current human condition is that the common world of deliberate and joint action is fragmented into solipsistic and unreflective behavior. In an especially lovely passage, she says that in mass society people are all imprisoned in the subjectivity of their own singular experience, which does not cease to be singular if the same experience is multiplied innumerable times. The end of the common world has come when it is seen only under one aspect and is permitted to present itself in only one perspective. (Human 58) What Arendt so beautifully describes is that isolation and individualism are not corollaries, and may even be antithetical because obsession with one's own self and the particularities of one's life prevents one from engaging in conscious, deliberate, collective action. Individuality, unlike isolation, depends upon a collective with whom one argues in order to direct the common life. Self-obsession, even (especially?) when coupled with isolation from one' s community is far from apolitical; it has political consequences. Perhaps a better way to put it is that it is political precisely because it aspires to be apolitical. This fragmented world in which many people live simultaneously and even similarly but not exactly together is what Arendt calls the "social." Arendt does not mean that group behavior is impossible in the realm of the social, but that social behavior consists "in some way of isolated individuals, incapable of solidarity or mutuality, who abdicate their human capacities and responsibilities to a projected 'they' or 'it,' with disastrous consequences, both for other people and eventually for themselves" (Pitkin 79). One can behave, butnot act. For someone like Arendt, a German-assimilated Jew, one of the most frightening aspects of the Holocaust was the ease with which a people who had not been extraordinarily anti-Semitic could be put to work industriously and efficiently on the genocide of the Jews. And what was striking about the perpetrators of the genocide, ranging from minor functionaries who facilitated the murder transports up to major figures on trial at Nuremberg, was their constant and apparently sincere insistence that they were not responsible. For Arendt, this was not a peculiarity of the German people, but of the current human and heavily bureaucratic condition of twentieth-century culture: we do not consciously choose to engage in life's activities; we drift into them, or we do them out of a desire to conform. Even while we do them, we do not acknowledge an active, willed choice to do them; instead, we attribute our behavior to necessity, and we perceive ourselves as determined—determined by circumstance, by accident, by what "they" tell us to do. We do something from within the anonymity of a mob that we would never do as an individual; we do things for which we will not take responsibility. Yet, whether or not people acknowledge responsibil¬ity for the consequences of their actions, those consequences exist. Refusing to accept responsibility can even make those consequences worse, in that the people who enact the actions in question, because they do not admit their own agency, cannot be persuaded to stop those actions. They are simply doing their jobs. In a totalitarian system, however, everyone is simply doing his or her job; there never seems to be anyone who can explain, defend, and change the policies. Thus, it is, as Arendt says, rule by nobody. It is illustrative to contrast Arendt's attitude toward discourse to Habermas'. While both are critical of modern bureaucratic and totalitar¬ian systems, Arendt's solution is the playful and competitive space of agonism; it is not the rational-critical public sphere. The "actual content of political life" is "the joy and the gratification that arise out of being in company with our peers, out of acting together and appearing in public, out of inserting ourselves into the world by word and deed, thus acquiring and sustaining our personal identity and beginning something entirely new" ("Truth" 263). According to Seyla Benhabib, Arendt's public realm emphasizes the assumption of competition, and it "represents that space of appearances in which moral and political greatness, heroism, and preeminence are revealed, displayed, shared with others. This is a competitive space in which one competes for recognition, precedence, and acclaim" (78). These qualities are displayed, but not entirely for purposes of acclamation; they are not displays of one's self, but of ideas and arguments, of one's thought. When Arendt discusses Socrates' thinking in public, she emphasizes his performance: "He performed in the marketplace the way the flute-player performed at a banquet. It is sheer performance, sheer activity"; nevertheless, it was thinking: "What he actually did was to make public, in discourse, the thinking process" {Lectures 37). Pitkin summarizes this point: "Arendt says that the heroism associated with politics is not the mythical machismo of ancient Greece but something more like the existential leap into action and public exposure" (175-76). Just as it is not machismo, although it does have considerable ego involved, so it is not instrumental rationality; Arendt's discussion of the kinds of discourse involved in public action include myths, stories, and personal narratives. Furthermore, the competition is not ruthless; it does not imply a willingness to triumph at all costs. Instead, it involves something like having such a passion for ideas and politics that one is willing to take risks. One tries to articulate the best argument, propose the best policy, design the best laws, make the best response. This is a risk in that one might lose; advancing an argument means that one must be open to the criticisms others will make of it. The situation is agonistic not because the participants manufacture or seek conflict, but because conflict is a necessary consequence of difference. This attitude is reminiscent of Kenneth Burke, who did not try to find a language free of domination but who instead theorized a way that the very tendency toward hierarchy in language might be used against itself (for more on this argument, see Kastely). Similarly, Arendt does not propose a public realm of neutral, rational beings who escape differences to live in the discourse of universals; she envisions one of different people who argue with passion, vehemence, and integrity. Continued… Eichmann perfectly exemplified what Arendt famously called the "banal¬ity of evil" but that might be better thought of as the bureaucratization of evil (or, as a friend once aptly put it, the evil of banality). That is, he was able to engage in mass murder because he was able not to think about it, especially not from the perspective of the victims, and he was able to exempt himself from personal responsibility by telling himself (and anyone else who would listen) that he was just following orders. It was the bureaucratic system that enabled him to do both. He was not exactly passive; he was, on the contrary, very aggressive in trying to do his duty. He behaved with the "ruthless, competitive exploitation" and "inauthen-tic, self-disparaging conformism" that characterizes those who people totalitarian systems (Pitkin 87). Arendt's theorizing of totalitarianism has been justly noted as one of her strongest contributions to philosophy. She saw that a situation like Nazi Germany is different from the conventional understanding of a tyranny. Pitkin writes, Totalitarianism cannot be understood, like earlier forms of domination, as the ruthless exploitation of some people by others, whether the motive be selfish calculation, irrational passion, or devotion to some cause. Understanding totalitarianism's essential nature requires solving the central mystery of the holocaust—the objectively useless and indeed dysfunctional, fanatical pursuit of a purely ideological policy, a pointless process to which the people enacting it have fallen captive. (87) Totalitarianism is closely connected to bureaucracy; it is oppression by rules, rather than by people who have willfully chosen to establish certain rules. It is the triumph of the social. Critics (both friendly and hostile) have paid considerable attention to Arendt's category of the "social," largely because, despite spending so much time on the notion, Arendt remains vague on certain aspects of it. Pitkin appropriately compares Arendt's concept of the social to the Blob, the type of monster that figured in so many post-war horror movies. That Blob was "an evil monster from outer space, entirely external to and separate from us [that] had fallen upon us intent on debilitating, absorb¬ing, and ultimately destroying us, gobbling up our distinct individuality and turning us into robots that mechanically serve its purposes" (4). Pitkin is critical of this version of the "social" and suggests that Arendt meant (or perhaps should have meant) something much more complicated. The simplistic version of the social-as-Blob can itself be an instance of Blob thinking; Pitkin's criticism is that Arendt talks at times as though the social comes from outside of us and has fallen upon us, turning us into robots. Yet, Arendt's major criticism of the social is that it involves seeing ourselves as victimized by something that comes from outside our own behavior. I agree with Pitkin that Arendt's most powerful descriptions of the social (and the other concepts similar to it, such as her discussion of totalitarianism, imperialism, Eichmann, and parvenus) emphasize that these processes are not entirely out of our control but that they happen to us when, and because, we keep refusing to make active choices. We create the social through negligence. It is not the sort of force in a Sorcerer's Apprentice, which once let loose cannot be stopped; on the contrary, it continues to exist because we structure our world to reward social behavior. Pitkin writes, "From childhood on, in virtually all our institutions, we reward euphemism, salesmanship, slo¬gans, and we punish and suppress truth-telling, originality, thoughtful-ness. So we continually cultivate ways of (not) thinking that induce the social" (274). I want to emphasize this point, as it is important for thinking about criticisms of some forms of the social construction of knowledge: denying our own agency is what enables the social to thrive. To put it another way, theories of powerlessness are self-fulfilling prophecies. Arendt grants that there are people who willed the Holocaust, but she insists that totalitarian systems result not so much from the Hitlers or Stalins as from the bureaucrats who may or may not agree with the established ideology but who enforce the rules for no stronger motive than a desire to avoid trouble with their superiors (see Eichmann and Life). They do not think about what they do. One might prevent such occurrences—or, at least, resist the modern tendency toward totalitarian¬ism—by thought: "critical thought is in principle anti-authoritarian" (Lectures 38). By "thought" Arendt does not mean eremitic contemplation; in fact, she has great contempt for what she calls "professional thinkers," refusing herself to become a philosopher or to call her work philosophy. Young-Bruehl, Benhabib, and Pitkin have each said that Heidegger represented just such a professional thinker for Arendt, and his embrace of Nazism epitomized the genuine dangers such "thinking" can pose (see Arendt's "Heidegger"). "Thinking" is not typified by the isolated con¬templation of philosophers; it requires the arguments of others and close attention to the truth. It is easy to overstate either part of that harmony. One must consider carefully the arguments and viewpoints of others: Political thought is representative. I form an opinion by considering a given issue from different viewpoints, by making present to my mind the standpoints of those who are absent; that is, I represent them. This process of representation does not blindly adopt the actual views of those who stand somewhere else, and hence look upon the world from a different perspective; this is a question neither of empathy, as though I tried to be or to feel like somebody else, nor of counting noses and joining a majority but of being and thinking in my own identity where actually I am not. The more people's standpoints I have present in my mind while I am ponder¬ing a given issue, and the better I can imagine how I would feel and think if I were in their place, the stronger will be my capacity for represen¬tative thinking and the more valid my final conclusions, my opinion. ("Truth" 241) There are two points to emphasize in this wonderful passage. First, one does not get these standpoints in one's mind through imagining them, but through listening to them; thus, good thinking requires that one hear the arguments of other people. Hence, as Arendt says, "critical thinking, while still a solitary business, does not cut itself off from' all others.'" Thinking is, in this view, necessarily public discourse: critical thinking is possible "only where the standpoints of all others are open to inspection" (Lectures 43). Yet, it is not a discourse in which one simply announces one's stance; participants are interlocutors and not just speakers; they must listen. Unlike many current versions of public discourse, this view presumes that speech matters. It is not asymmetric manipulation of others, nor merely an economic exchange; it must be a world into which one enters and by which one might be changed. Second, passages like the above make some readers think that Arendt puts too much faith in discourse and too little in truth (see Habermas). But Arendt is no crude relativist; she believes in truth, and she believes that there are facts that can be more or less distorted. She does not believe that reality is constructed by discourse, or that truth is indistinguishable from falsehood. She insists tha^ the truth has a different pull on us and, consequently, that it has a difficult place in the world of the political. Facts are different from falsehood because, while they can be distorted or denied, especially when they are inconvenient for the powerful, they also have a certain positive force that falsehood lacks: "Truth, though powerless and always defe ated in a head-on clash with the powers that be, possesses a strength of its own: whatever those in power may contrive, they are unable to discover or invent a viable substitute for it. Persuasion and violence can destroy truth, but they cannot replace it" ("Truth" 259). Facts have a strangely resilient quality partially because a lie "tears, as it were, a hole in the fabric of factuality. As every historian knows, one can spot a lie by noticing incongruities, holes, or the j unctures of patched-up places" ("Truth" 253). While she is sometimes discouraging about our ability to see the tears in the fabric, citing the capacity of totalitarian governments to create the whole cloth (see "Truth" 252-54), she is also sometimes optimistic. InEichmann in Jerusalem, she repeats the story of Anton Schmidt—a man who saved the lives of Jews—and concludes that such stories cannot be silenced (230-32). For facts to exert power in the common world, however, these stories must be told. Rational truth (such as principles of mathematics) might be perceptible and demonstrable through individual contemplation, but "factual truth, on the contrary, is always related to other people: it concerns events and circumstances in which many are involved; it is established by witnesses and depends upon testimony; it exists only to the extent that it is spoken about, even if it occurs in the domain of privacy. It is political by nature" (23 8). Arendt is neither a positivist who posits an autonomous individual who can correctly perceive truth, nor a relativist who positively asserts the inherent relativism of all perception. Her description of how truth functions does not fall anywhere in the three-part expeditio so prevalent in bothrhetoric and philosophy: it is not expressivist, positivist, or social constructivist. Good thinking depends upon good public argument, and good public argument depends upon access to facts: "Freedom of opinion is a farce unless factual information is guaranteed" (238). The sort of thinking that Arendt propounds takes the form of action only when it is public argument, and, as such, it is particularly precious: "For if no other test but the experience of being active, no other measure but the extent of sheer activity were to be applied to the various activities within the vita activa, it might well be that thinking as such would surpass them all" (Human 325). Arendt insists that it is "the same general rule— Do not contradict yourself (not your self but your thinking ego)—that determines both thinking and acting" (Lectures 3 7). In place of the mildly resentful conformism that fuels totalitarianism, Arendt proposes what Pitkin calls "a tough-minded, open-eyed readiness to perceive and judge reality for oneself, in terms of concrete experience and independent, critical theorizing" (274). The paradoxical nature of agonism (that it must involve both individuality and commonality) makes it difficult to maintain, as the temptation is great either to think one's own thoughts without reference to anyone else or to let others do one's thinking. Arendt's Polemical Agonism As I said, agonism does have its advocates within rhetoric—Burke, Ong, Sloane, Gage, and Jarratt, for instance—but while each of these theorists proposes a form of conflictual argument, not one of these is as adversarial as Arendt's. Agonism can emphasize persuasion, as does John Gage's textbook The Shape of Reason or William Brandt et al.'s The Craft of Writing. That is, the goal of the argument is to identify the disagreement and then construct a text that gains the assent of the audience. This is not the same as what Gage (citing Thomas Conley) calls "asymmetrical theories of rhetoric": theories that "presuppose an active speaker and a passive audience, a speaker whose rhetorical task is therefore to do something to that audience" ("Reasoned" 6). Asymmetric rhetoric is not and cannot be agonistic. Persuasive agonism still values conflict, disagreement, and equality among interlocutors, but it has the goal of reaching agreement, as when Gage says that the process of argument should enable one's reasons to be "understood and believed" by others (Shape 5; emphasis added). Arendt's version is what one might call polemical agonism: it puts less emphasis on gaining assent, and it is exemplified both in Arendt's own writing and in Donald Lazere's "Ground Rules for Polemicists" and "Teaching the Political Conflicts." Both forms of agonism (persuasive and polemical) require substantive debate at two points in a long and recursive process. First, one engages in debate in order to invent one's argument; even silent thinking is a "dialogue of myself with myself (Lectures 40). The difference between the two approaches to agonism is clearest when one presents an argument to an audience assumed to be an opposition. In persuasive agonism, one plays down conflict and moves through reasons to try to persuade one's audience. In polemical agonism, however, one's intention is not necessarily to prove one's case, but to make public one' s thought in order to test it. In this way, communicability serves the same function in philosophy that replicability serves in the sciences; it is how one tests the validity of one's thought. In persuasive agonism, success is achieved through persuasion; in polemical agonism, success may be marked through the quality of subsequent controversy. Arendt quotes from a letter Kant wrote on this point: You know that I do not approach reasonable objections with the intention merely of refuting them, but that in thinking them over I always weave them into my judgments, and afford them the opportunity of overturning all my most cherished beliefs. I entertain the hope that by thus viewing my judgments impartially from the standpoint of others some third view that will improve upon my previous insight may be obtainable. {Lectures 42) Kant's use of "impartial" here is interesting: he is not describing a stance that is free of all perspective; it is impartial only in the sense that it is not his own view. This is the same way that Arendt uses the term; she does not advocate any kind of positivistic rationality, but instead a "universal interdependence" ("Truth" 242). She does not place the origin of the "disinterested pursuit of truth" in science, but at "the moment when Homer chose to sing the deeds of the Trojans no less than those of the Achaeans, and to praise the glory of Hector, the foe and the defeated man, no less than the glory of Achilles, the hero of his kinfolk" ("Truth" 262¬63). It is useful to note that Arendt tends not to use the term "universal," opting more often for "common," by which she means both what is shared and what is ordinary, a usage that evades many of the problems associated with universalism while preserving its virtues (for a brief butprovocative application of Arendt's notion of common, see Hauser 100-03). In polemical agonism, there is a sense in which one' s main goal is not to persuade one's readers; persuading one's readers, if this means that they fail to see errors and flaws in one' s argument, might actually be a sort of failure. It means that one wishes to put forward an argument that makes clear what one's stance is and why one holds it, but with the intention of provoking critique and counterargument. Arendt describes Kant's "hope" for his writings not that the number of people who agree with him would increase but "that the circle of his examiners would gradually be en¬larged" {Lectures 39); he wanted interlocutors, not acolytes. This is not consensus-based argument, nor is it what is sometimes called "consociational argument," nor is this argument as mediation or conflict resolution. Arendt (and her commentators) use the term "fight," and they mean it. When Arendt describes the values that are necessary in our world, she says, "They are a sense of honor, desire for fame and glory, the spirit of fighting without hatred and 'without the spirit of revenge,' and indifference to material advantages" {Crises 167). Pitkin summarizes Arendt's argument: "Free citizenship presupposes the ability to fight— openly, seriously, with commitment, and about things that really mat¬ter—without fanaticism, without seeking to exterminate one's oppo¬nents" (266). My point here is two-fold: first, there is not a simple binary opposition between persuasive discourse and eristic discourse, the conflictual versus the collaborative, or argument as opposed to debate. Second, while polemical agonismrequires diversity among interlocutors, and thus seems an extraordinarily appropriate notion, and while it may be a useful corrective to too much emphasis on persuasion, it seems to me that polemical agonism could easily slide into the kind of wrangling that is simply frustrating. Arendt does not describe just how one is to keep the conflict useful. Although she rejects the notion that politics is "no more than a battlefield of partial, conflicting interests, where nothing countfs] but pleasure and profit, partisanship, and the lust for dominion," she does not say exactly how we are to know when we are engaging in the existential leap of argument versus when we are lusting for dominion ("Truth" 263). Like other proponents of agonism, Arendt argues that rhetoric does not lead individuals or communities to ultimate Truth; it leads to decisions that will necessarily have to be reconsidered. Even Arendt, who tends to express a greater faith than many agonists (such as Burke, Sloane, or Kastely) in the ability of individuals to perceive truth, insists that self-deception is always a danger, so public discourse is necessary as a form of testing (see especially Lectures and "Truth"). She remarks that it is difficult to think beyond one's self-interest and that "nothing, indeed, is more common, even among highly sophisticated people, than the blind obstinacy that becomes manifest in lack of imagination and failure to judge" ("Truth" 242). Agonism demands that one simultaneously trust and doubt one' s own perceptions, rely on one's own judgment and consider the judgments of others, think for oneself and imagine how others think. The question remains whether this is a kind of thought in which everyone can engage. Is the agonistic public sphere (whether political, academic, or scientific) only available to the few? Benhabib puts this criticism in the form of a question: "That is, is the 'recovery of the public space' under conditions of modernity necessarily an elitist and antidemocratic project that can hardly be reconciled with the demand for universal political emancipa¬tion and the universal extension of citizenship rights that have accompa¬nied modernity since the American and French Revolutions?" (75). This is an especially troubling question not only because Arendt's examples of agonistic rhetoric are from elitist cultures, but also because of com¬ments she makes, such as this one from The Human Condition: "As a living experience, thought has always been assumed, perhaps wrongly, to be known only to the few. It may not be presumptuous to believe that these few have not become fewer in our time" {Human 324). Yet, there are important positive political consequences of agonism. Arendt' s own promotion of the agonistic sphere helps to explain how the system could be actively moral. It is not an overstatement to say that a central theme in Arendt's work is the evil of conformity—the fact that the modern bureaucratic state makes possible extraordinary evil carried out by people who do not even have any ill will toward their victims. It does so by "imposing innumerable and various rules, all of which tend to 'normalize' its members, to make them behave, to exclude spontaneous action or outstanding achievement" (Human 40). It keeps people from thinking, and it keeps them behaving. The agonistic model's celebration of achievement and verbal skill undermines the political force of conformity, so it is a force against the bureaucratizing of evil. If people think for themselves, they will resist dogma; if people think of themselves as one of many, they will empathize; if people can do both, they will resist totalitarianism. And if they talk about what they see, tell their stories, argue about their perceptions, and listen to one another—that is, engage in rhetoric—then they are engaging in antitotalitarian action. In post-Ramistic rhetoric, it is a convention to have a thesis, and one might well wonder just what mine is—whether I am arguing for or against Arendt's agonism. Arendt does not lay out a pedagogy for us to follow (although one might argue that, if she had, it would lookmuch like the one Lazere describes in "Teaching"), so I am not claiming that greater attention to Arendt would untangle various pedagogical problems that teachers of writing face. Nor am I claiming that applying Arendt's views will resolve theoretical arguments that occupy scholarly journals. I am saying, on the one hand, that Arendt's connection of argument and thinking, as well as her perception that both serve to thwart totalitarian¬ism, suggest that agonal rhetoric (despite the current preference for collaborative rhetoric) is the best discourse for a diverse and inclusive public sphere. On the other hand, Arendt's advocacy of agonal rhetoric is troubling (and, given her own admiration for Kant, this may be intentional), especially in regard to its potential elitism, masculinism, failure to describe just how to keep argument from collapsing into wrangling, and apparently cheerful acceptance of hierarchy. Even with these flaws, Arendt describes something we would do well to consider thoughtfully: a fact-based but not positivist, communally grounded but not relativist, adversarial but not violent, independent but not expressivist rhetoric.

#### C) State action

#### Scientific and instrumental argumentation and research is key to motivate legislative fence-sitters – turns the aff
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[heath, PhD Political Science, Roanoke, Salem, VA, “narrative strategies used by interest groups during the 2008 presidental transition”, 2011 Pat-Net Conference]

Milbrath argues that interest groups must strategically present information so as to ¶ overcome the “perceptual screen” that shields policy makers from absorbing endless amounts ¶ of information. He suggests that groups use facts (scientific information about policy ¶ outcomes), arguments (normative explanations of justness or rightness of action), and power¶ (typically subtle offers of political support or threats of political retribution) to communicate ¶ their interests and make their case for policy action (or inaction). In a more recent approach, ¶ Esterling (2007, p. 79) makes the case that groups can use [using] “instrumental” – “research or ¶ evidence-based causal” arguments -- or “normative” – “intrinsic desirability” arguments. By ¶ emphasizing one of these approaches, a group is tacitly communicating the way it wants to ¶ persuade the target of the information. By emphasizing power or normative arguments, the ¶ group implies that the policy maker should make decisions based primarily on their political ¶ judgment and political future. Conversely, by emphasizing facts-based or instrumental ¶ arguments, the group implies that the policy maker should base decisions primarily on rational ¶ or scientific considerations. In practice, it is difficult to disentangle these two types of ¶ arguments and many groups will likely combine various ways to present information (Wright ¶ 1996; Rochefort and Cobb 1994). The dichotomy though does help clarify the persuasive or ¶ argumentative tone of the information and advice given by groups to policy makers. 6 ¶ While public perceptions of interest groups might suggest crass self-interest, ¶ manipulation, and deception, groups have an incentive to be forthright in the information they ¶ provide and arguments they make. A group that provides shoddy statistics or misleading ¶ arguments will be discounted in future interactions with the policy maker (Kersh 2009; ¶ Easterling 2007). John E. Chubb (1983, p. 145) writes in regard to energy interest groups: ¶ “information and advice that are solely self-serving threaten the bond of trust that facilitates ¶ the informal play of influence.” In fact, rather than targeting political opponents or fence ¶ sitters, much research suggests that groups prefer or are invited to lobby friends and allies over ¶ adversaries (Baumgartner et al. 2009; Hojnacki and Kimball 1998, 1999; Hall and Deardorff ¶ 2006; Bauer et al. 1963; Holyoke 2004; McCool 1990). If this is the case, the cost of ¶ misrepresenting or overstating information may be particularly high for those engaged in what ¶ Hall and Deardorff (2006) and others have called “legislative subsidy” (Hall and Deardorff 2006; ¶ Esterling 2007a). From this subsidy perspective, if a policy maker is sub-contracting information ¶ collection and analysis to an allied interest group, it behooves that group to be conscientious, ¶ thorough, and consistent in the information and advice it gives. And in many cases, as Wright ¶ (1996) contends, it is relatively easy for policy makers to check the authenticity of the ¶ information provided to them, sometimes simply through the contradictory information ¶ provided by other groups, thereby curtailing the inclination to blatantly misrepresent the truth. ¶ Furthermore, experimental research shows that factual or instrumental information is ¶ preferred by legislative staff (LaPira 2008) and neutral expert lobbyists have more legislative ¶ access than non-experts (Esterling 2007b). Facts may be useful on their own terms in ¶ formulating legislative decisions but scientific or statistically based arguments also serve as a 7 ¶ cue for policy makers to determine the credibility or reliability of the advice they are given ¶ (Sabatier 1978). ¶ Rather than convince those already in agreement, the approach taken by proactive ¶ theorists suggests that groups seek to convince legislative fence sitters or opponents to adopt ¶ the group’s position, advocate the group’s interests, or simply vote in the group’s way through ¶ the offer of, or refusal to give, political support (Smith 1984; Austen-Smith and Wright 1994; ¶ Wright 1996). Wright (1990) for one finds that groups which distribute campaign contributions ¶ to a wide group of legislators are then able to access a wider group, rather than just political ¶ allies (Wright 1990). Similarly, Heberling (2005) shows that one group, the AFL-CIO, seeks out ¶ legislators with unknown political preferences rather than targeting political allies (Heberling ¶ 2005). The field of interest group research has not yet resolved whether groups typically lobby ¶ friends, adversaries, or some combination of the two (Leech and Baumgartner 1998). This is ¶ likely due to the wide variation of group types and also policy domains in which groups operate. ¶ These inter-organizational and inter-policy differences affect the strategies employed and ¶ therefore the content of information presented during lobbying.

#### D) Switch Side

#### Its key to effective deliberation over environmental issues
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(Gordon R., Associate Professor, Director of Graduate Studies, and Director of the William Pitt Debating Union at the University of Pittsburgh; Spring, “Switch-Side Debating Meets Demand-Driven Rhetoric of Science,” Rhetoric & Public Affairs, Vol. 13, No. 1 – Kurr)

The preceding analysis of U.S. intelligence community debating initiatives highlighted how analysts are challenged to navigate discursively the heteroglossia of vast amounts of different kinds of data flowing through intelligence streams. Public policy planners are tested in like manner when they attempt to stitch together institutional arguments from various and sundry inputs ranging from expert testimony, to historical precedent, to public comment. Just as intelligence managers find that algorithmic, formal methods of analysis often don't work when it comes to the task of interpreting and synthesizing copious amounts of disparate data, public-policy planners encounter similar challenges. In fact, the argumentative turn in public-policy planning elaborates an approach to public-policy analysis that foregrounds deliberative interchange and critical thinking as alternatives to "decisionism," the formulaic application of "objective" decision algorithms to the public policy process. Stating the matter plainly, Majone suggests, "whether in written or oral form, argument is central in all stages of the policy process." Accordingly, he notes, "we miss a great deal if we try to understand policy-making solely in terms of power, influence, and bargaining, to the exclusion of debate and argument."51 One can see similar rationales driving Goodwin and Davis's EPA debating project, where debaters are invited to conduct on-site public debates covering resolutions crafted to reflect key points of stasis in the EPA decision-making process. For example, in the 2008 Water Wars debates held at EPA headquarters in Washington, D.C., resolutions were crafted to focus attention on the topic of water pollution, with one resolution focusing on downstream states' authority to control upstream states' discharges and sources of pollutants, and a second resolution exploring the policy merits of bottled water and toilet paper taxes as revenue sources to fund water infrastructure projects. In the first debate on interstate river pollution, the team of Seth Gannon and Seungwon Chung from Wake Forest University argued in favor of downstream state control, with the Michigan State University team of Carly Wunderlich and Garrett Abelkop providing opposition. In the second debate on taxation policy, Kevin Kallmyer and Matthew Struth from University of Mary Washington defended taxes on bottled water and toilet paper, while their opponents from Howard University, Dominique Scott and Jarred McKee, argued against this proposal. Reflecting on the project, Goodwin noted how the intercollegiate [End Page 106] debaters' ability to act as "honest brokers" in the policy arguments contributed positively to internal EPA deliberation on both issues.52 Davis observed that since the invited debaters "didn't have a dog in the fight," they were able to give voice to previously buried arguments that some EPA subject matter experts felt reticent to elucidate because of their institutional affiliations.53 Such findings are consistent with the views of policy analysts advocating the argumentative turn in policy planning. As Majone claims, "Dialectical confrontation between generalists and experts often succeeds in bringing out unstated assumptions, conflicting interpretations of the facts, and the risks posed by new projects."54 Frank Fischer goes even further in this context, explicitly appropriating rhetorical scholar Charles Willard's concept of argumentative "epistemics" to flesh out his vision for policy studies: Uncovering the epistemic dynamics of public controversies would allow for a more enlightened understanding of what is at stake in a particular dispute, making possible a sophisticated evaluation of the various viewpoints and merits of different policy options. In so doing, the differing, often tacitly held contextual perspectives and values could be juxtaposed; the viewpoints and demands of experts, special interest groups, and the wider public could be directly compared; and the dynamics among the participants could be scrutizined. This would by no means sideline or even exclude scientific assessment; it would only situate it within the framework of a more comprehensive evaluation.55 As Davis notes, institutional constraints present within the EPA communicative milieu can complicate efforts to provide a full airing of all relevant arguments pertaining to a given regulatory issue. Thus, intercollegiate debaters can play key roles in retrieving and amplifying positions that might otherwise remain sedimented in the policy process. The dynamics entailed in this symbiotic relationship are underscored by deliberative planner John Forester, who observes, "If planners and public administrators are to make democratic political debate and argument possible, they will need strategically located allies to avoid being fully thwarted by the characteristic self-protecting behaviors of the planning organizations and bureaucracies within which they work."56 Here, an institution's need for "strategically located allies" to support deliberative practice constitutes the demand for rhetorically informed expertise, setting up what can be considered a demand-driven rhetoric of science. As an instance of rhetoric of science scholarship, this type of "switch-side public [End Page 107] debate"57 differs both from insular contest tournament debating, where the main focus is on the pedagogical benefit for student participants, and first-generation rhetoric of science scholarship, where critics concentrated on unmasking the rhetoricity of scientific artifacts circulating in what many perceived to be purely technical spheres of knowledge production.58 As a form of demand-driven rhetoric of science, switch-side debating connects directly with the communication field's performative tradition of argumentative engagement in public controversy—a different route of theoretical grounding than rhetorical criticism's tendency to locate its foundations in the English field's tradition of literary criticism and textual analysis.59 Given this genealogy, it is not surprising to learn how Davis's response to the EPA's institutional need for rhetorical expertise took the form of a public debate proposal, shaped by Davis's dual background as a practitioner and historian of intercollegiate debate. Davis competed as an undergraduate policy debater for Howard University in the 1970s, and then went on to enjoy substantial success as coach of the Howard team in the new millennium. In an essay reviewing the broad sweep of debating history, Davis notes, "Academic debate began at least 2,400 years ago when the scholar Protagoras of Abdera (481–411 BC), known as the father of debate, conducted debates among his students in Athens."60 As John Poulakos points out, "older" Sophists such as Protagoras taught Greek students the value of dissoi logoi, or pulling apart complex questions by debating two sides of an issue.61 The few surviving fragments of Protagoras's work suggest that his notion of dissoi logoi stood for the principle that "two accounts [logoi] are present about every 'thing,' opposed to each other," and further, that humans could "measure" the relative soundness of knowledge claims by engaging in give-and-take where parties would make the "weaker argument stronger" to activate the generative aspect of rhetorical practice, a key element of the Sophistical tradition.62 Following in Protagoras's wake, Isocrates would complement this centrifugal push with the pull of synerchésthé, a centripetal exercise of "coming together" deliberatively to listen, respond, and form common social bonds.63 Isocrates incorporated Protagorean dissoi logoi into synerchésthé, a broader concept that he used flexibly to express interlocking senses of (1) inquiry, as in groups convening to search for answers to common questions through discussion;64 (2) deliberation, with interlocutors gathering in a political setting to deliberate about proposed courses of action;65 and (3) alliance formation, a form of collective action typical at festivals,66 or in the exchange of pledges that deepen social ties.67 [End Page 108] Returning once again to the Kettering-informed sharp distinction between debate and deliberation, one sees in Isocratic synerchésthé, as well as in the EPA debating initiative, a fusion of debate with deliberative functions. Echoing a theme raised in this essay's earlier discussion of intelligence tradecraft, such a fusion troubles categorical attempts to classify debate and deliberation as fundamentally opposed activities. The significance of such a finding is amplified by the frequency of attempts in the deliberative democracy literature to insist on the theoretical bifurcation of debate and deliberation as an article of theoretical faith. Tandem analysis of the EPA and intelligence community debating initiatives also brings to light dimensions of contrast at the third level of Isocratic synerchésthé, alliance formation. The intelligence community's Analytic Outreach initiative invites largely one-way communication flowing from outside experts into the black box of classified intelligence analysis. On the contrary, the EPA debating program gestures toward a more expansive project of deliberative alliance building. In this vein, Howard University's participation in the 2008 EPA Water Wars debates can be seen as the harbinger of a trend by historically black colleges and universities (HBCUS) to catalyze their debate programs in a strategy that evinces Davis's dual-focus vision. On the one hand, Davis aims to recuperate Wiley College's tradition of competitive excellence in intercollegiate debate, depicted so powerfully in the feature film The Great Debaters, by starting a wave of new debate programs housed in HBCUS across the nation.68 On the other hand, Davis sees potential for these new programs to complement their competitive debate programming with participation in the EPA's public debating initiative. This dual-focus vision recalls Douglas Ehninger's and Wayne Brockriede's vision of "total" debate programs that blend switch-side intercollegiate tournament debating with forms of public debate designed to contribute to wider communities beyond the tournament setting.69 Whereas the political telos animating Davis's dual-focus vision certainly embraces background assumptions that Greene and Hicks would find disconcerting—notions of liberal political agency, the idea of debate using "words as weapons"70—there is little doubt that the project of pursuing environmental protection by tapping the creative energy of HBCU-leveraged dissoi logoi differs significantly from the intelligence community's effort to improve its tradecraft through online digital debate programming. Such difference is especially evident in light of the EPA's commitment to extend debates to public realms, with the attendant possible benefits unpacked by Jane Munksgaard and Damien Pfister: [End Page 109] Having a public debater argue against their convictions, or confess their indecision on a subject and subsequent embrace of argument as a way to seek clarity, could shake up the prevailing view of debate as a war of words. Public uptake of the possibility of switch-sides debate may help lessen the polarization of issues inherent in prevailing debate formats because students are no longer seen as wedded to their arguments. This could transform public debate from a tussle between advocates, with each public debater trying to convince the audience in a Manichean struggle about the truth of their side, to a more inviting exchange focused on the content of the other's argumentation and the process of deliberative exchange.71 Reflection on the EPA debating initiative reveals a striking convergence among (1) the expressed need for dissoi logoi by government agency officials wrestling with the challenges of inverted rhetorical situations, (2) theoretical claims by scholars regarding the centrality of argumentation in the public policy process, and (3) the practical wherewithal of intercollegiate debaters to tailor public switch-side debating performances in specific ways requested by agency collaborators. These points of convergence both underscore previously articulated theoretical assertions regarding the relationship of debate to deliberation, as well as deepen understanding of the political role of deliberation in institutional decision making. But they also suggest how decisions by rhetorical scholars about whether to contribute switch-side debating acumen to meet demand-driven rhetoric of science initiatives ought to involve careful reflection. Such an approach mirrors the way policy planning in the "argumentative turn" is designed to respond to the weaknesses of formal, decisionistic paradigms of policy planning with situated, contingent judgments informed by reflective deliberation.

### 2

#### BATAILLE’S PERSPECTIVE OF ENERGY MOVEMENT, THE ENVIRONMENT AND ANIMALITY ARE ANTHROPOCENTRIC.

Tyler 2k5

[tom, like water in water, journal for cultural research, vol 9, no 3, july]

That which in humans is fully formed appears in animals as a merely “embryonic”¶ proto-manifestation, groping toward full realization.¶ In his opening chapter, Bataille is principally concerned with introducing, and¶ tentatively exploring, the notion of immanence. It is to this end that he embarks¶ on a discussion of animality, and from here later moves to a study of human¶ religious, economic and military affairs.3 That Bataille has no interest in animality¶ or animals in their own right is not, of itself, a matter for concern. But he does¶ here articulate especially clearly a pair of inter-related claims regarding the¶ relationship between humanity, animality and knowledge. These claims¶ frequently surface, more or less explicitly, when the animal comes under scrutiny,¶ and the value of my own rather narrow reading of Bataille’s text thus lies¶ in their analysis, and the broader concerns that they throw open.¶ First, the two claims. On the one hand, the perfect continuity that, according¶ to Bataille, exists between animal and environment, the lack of transcendence,¶ means that phenomena are not distinguished as objects. The animal has no¶ meaning, no knowledge of the world, and exists, as we have seen, like water in¶ water. On the other hand, in virtue of the fact that the existence of the animal¶ consists in this uniformity with the environment, that existence is utterly closed¶ to us. Compelled always to impose precisely those divisions which are denied to¶ the animal, humans cannot entertain any meaningful understanding of animal¶ life. In short, the reason the animal is closed to us, the reason we cannot have¶ knowledge of the animal, is that there is no meaning, no knowledge for the¶ animal. Taken together, the implication of these two claims is that knowledge¶ (meaning, understanding, cognition) is always and only human. We who do and¶ must have knowledge are condemned to our own perspective, to an inevitable¶ anthropocentrism. Any attempt to step outside this limitation, to articulate an¶ understanding or knowledge which is not constrained in this way, will unavoidably¶ descend into poetic babbling.¶ Is (our) knowledge inherently and inevitably constrained in this way? It is¶ unavoidable, Bataille says, that we should regard the animal as lacking transcendence¶ (pp. 23, 24). But he has here already assumed a qualitative difference¶ between human and animal experience which he has not demonstrated. The life¶ of the animal, he says, is closed to us; its place in the world seems in our eyes¶ to be one of complete immanence (pp. 20, 24). The pronouns, here and elsewhere¶ in the chapter, are instructive. They refer exclusively to the human. In so¶ doing, Bataille gives priority to the human perspective, “our” starting point, and¶ suggests that this human perspective is inescapable. When he asserts that “[f]or¶ the moment, I need to set apart from the dazzle of poetry that which, from the¶ standpoint of experience, appears distinctly and clearly” he is attempting to take¶ stock from the standpoint of human experience (p. 23). Despite his poetic¶ 3. Baudrillard suggests that, along with The Accursed Share, Theory of Religion functions as a kind¶ of apologetic, defensive attempt by Bataille to provide a foundation for his vision of the sacred,¶ which is fundamentally at odds with the particularities of his other writings (Baudrillard 1998,¶ p. 191).¶ suggestion that the animal’s immediacy is in fact our own, Bataille assumes that,¶ in a sense, we are human before we are animal.4¶ We will return to this issue of the temporal pre-eminence of the human¶ shortly. First, however, I would like to look a little closer at the question of¶ anthropocentrism. If we are to seize the opportunity to gaze out across new¶ vistas, it is important that we examine the nature of the limitations that have¶ been placed on those eyes, human or otherwise, that would attempt to apprehend¶ a novel landscape. Before we gaze outwards, then, we would do well to¶ look down, toward that perplexing, unfathomable depth.

#### AND, this species-contingent paradigm creates unending genocidal violence against forms of life deemed politically unqualified.

KOCHI & ORDAN 2K8

[tarik and noam, queen’s university and bar llan university, “an argument for the global suicide of humanity”, vol 7. no. 4., bourderlands e-journal]

Within the picture many paint of humanity, events such as the Holocaust are considered as an exception, an aberration. The Holocaust is often portrayed as an example of ‘evil’, a moment of hatred, madness and cruelty (cf. the differing accounts of ‘evil’ given in Neiman, 2004). The event is also treated as one through which humanity comprehend its own weakness and draw strength, via the resolve that such actions will never happen again. However, if we take seriously the differing ways in which the Holocaust was ‘evil’, then one must surely include along side it the almost uncountable numbers of genocides that have occurred throughout human history. Hence, if we are to think of the content of the ‘human heritage’, then this must include the annihilation of indigenous peoples and their cultures across the globe and the manner in which their beliefs, behaviours and social practices have been erased from what the people of the ‘West’ generally consider to be the content of a human heritage. Again the history of colonialism is telling here. It reminds us exactly how normal, regular and mundane acts of annihilation of different forms of human life and culture have been throughout human history. Indeed the history of colonialism, in its various guises, points to the fact that so many of our legal institutions and forms of ethical life (i.e. nation-states which pride themselves on protecting human rights through the rule of law) have been founded upon colonial violence, war and the appropriation of other peoples’ land (Schmitt, 2003; Benjamin, 1986). Further, the history of colonialism highlights the central function of ‘race war’ that often underlies human social organisation and many of its legal and ethical systems of thought (Foucault, 2003). This history of modern colonialism thus presents a key to understanding that events such as the Holocaust are not an aberration and exception but are closer to the norm, and sadly, lie at the heart of any heritage of humanity. After all, all too often the European colonisation of the globe was justified by arguments that indigenous inhabitants were racially ‘inferior’ and in some instances that they were closer to ‘apes’ than to humans (Diamond, 2006). Such violence justified by an erroneous view of ‘race’ is in many ways merely an extension of an underlying attitude of speciesism involving a long history of killing and enslavement of non-human species by humans. Such a connection between the two histories of inter-human violence (via the mythical notion of differing human ‘races’) and interspecies violence, is well expressed in Isaac Bashevis Singer’s comment that whereas humans consider themselves “the crown of creation”, for animals “all people are Nazis” and animal life is “an eternal Treblinka” (Singer, 1968, p.750).

#### Alternative: the judge should vote negative to REJECT THE HUMAN/ANIMAL DIVIDE.

#### this rejection enables an understanding of the SPECIES-BEING. that SOLVES THE ETHICAL CONTRADICTION OF THEIR SPECIES-LEVEL RACISM.

HUDSON 2K4

[Laura, The Political Animal: Species-Being and Bare Life, mediations journal, http://www.mediationsjournal.org/files/Mediations23\_2\_04.pdf]

We are all equally reduced to mere specimens of human biology, mute and uncomprehending of the world in which we are thrown. Species-being, or “humanity as a species,” may require this recognition to move beyond the pseudo-essence of the religion of humanism. Recognizing that what we call “the human” is an abstraction that fails to fully describe what we are, we may come to find a new way of understanding humanity that recuperates the natural without domination. The bare life that results from expulsion from the law removes even the illusion of freedom. Regardless of one’s location in production, the threat of losing even the fiction of citizenship and freedom affects everyone. This may create new means of organizing resistance across the particular divisions of society. Furthermore, the concept of bare life allows us to gesture toward a more detailed, concrete idea of what species-being may look like. Agamben hints that in the recognition of this fact, that in our essence we are all animals, that we are all living dead, might reside the possibility of a kind of redemption. Rather than the mystical horizon of a future community, the passage to species-being may be experienced as a deprivation, a loss of identity. Species-being is not merely a positive result of the development of history; it is equally the absence of many of the features of “humanity” through which we have learned to make sense of our world. It is an absence of the kind of individuality and atomism that structure our world under capitalism and underlie liberal democracy, and which continue to inform the tenets of deep ecology. The development of species-being requires the collapse of the distinction between human and animal in order to change the shape of our relationships with the natural world. A true species-being depends on a sort of reconciliation between our “human” and “animal” selves, a breakdown of the distinction between the two both within ourselves and in nature in general. Bare life would then represent not only expulsion from the law but the possibility of its overcoming. Positioned in the zone of indistinction, no longer a subject of the law but still subjected to it through absence, what we equivocally call “the human” in general becomes virtually indistinguishable from the animal or nature. But through this expulsion and absence, we may see not only the law but the system of capitalism that shapes it from a position no longer blinded or captivated by its spell. The structure of the law is revealed as always suspect in the false division between natural and political life, which are never truly separable. Though clearly the situation is not yet as dire as Agamben’s invocation of the Holocaust suggests, we are all, as citizens, under the threat of the state of exception. With the decline of the nation as a form of social organization, the whittling away of civil liberties and, with them, the state’s promise of “the good life” (or “the good death”) even in the most developed nations, with the weakening of labor as the bearer of resistance to exploitation, how are we to envision the future of politics and society?

### Case

#### Overusage of flesh metaphors renders them “dead”, they become meaningless and profane; destroys solvency

Seifried 12

[Evan, <http://www.renovationchurch.net/blog/post/discipleship-hurts>, mg]

As I read the first passage from Hosea today, I realized that we have become far too comfortable with the metaphors of the Bible. Through repetitive reading, memorization, countless Sunday School classes and sermons, we've lost the thrust, the bite, of Scripture's gritty metaphors. Metaphors become dead from overuse, and we're guilty of killing many of them. (When was the last time you prayed "Father…" and actually imagined God as your father?) Our commonplace, comfortable Christianity has enervated our imaginations such that we no longer allow metaphors to do what they were meant to do, which is to shock us into action. We have so domesticated Jesus' words (for example, about hating mother and father) that we refuse to bring the intent of those shocking words to bear in our lives.¶ Following Jesus is hard. It hurts. It is painful to our flesh that cries out against its being sacrificed. I believe this is precisely why God, in the superintending and writing of his Word, chose to use such painful metaphors, because discipleship is extremely difficult. But it's what we are called to. If we are truly in Christ and have been risen with him, the mortification of the flesh is our new way of life. Jesus said that, as his servants, we are not greater than him; if he was persecuted, if he suffered, then we, as his followers, will suffer persecution as well. But blessed are we who suffer for righteousness' sake, because we get the kingdom.¶ I thank God that he disciplines those whom he loves, because if he didn't, I would love myself to destruction. Although God's love, expressed through the sanctifying of his children, hurts, we know that it is only the sinful flesh, the old person, that is suffering, crying out in protest of its own demise.¶ Scripture's **metaphors are meant to be shocking**. They exist to keep us from reading over the living Word of God too quickly. Stop and contemplate the inherent pain of discipleship, and ask God to resurrect the metaphors you've killed from overuse, the ones you've worn out without giving them a second thought. Meditate on them and see how you are loved by your Father.¶

#### Space exploration results from our viewing of space as an infinite standing reserve, the supreme manifestation of the danger of technology.

Soccio in 09 (Douglas J., Professor of Philosophy @ Shasta University Archetypes of Wisdom: An Introduction to Philosophy Seventh Edition The Age of Technology: Danger p.515, 2009) JM

We measure—“order”—the cosmos itself, looking to outer space for new sources of energy to add to the ever-expanding standing-reserve. When nature as a whole is threatened by technology, we employ technology to count and record (“order”) endangered species via wireless transmitters. We scientifically analyze soil and air samples, track storms via satellite, and obsessively tweak additives and supplements to enhance our food supply. We seek out new superdrugs to kill off superbugs created by older drugs crafted to kill off older bugs. Yet in these very attempts to control the world and to come to technically “correct” understandings of the world, “the truth will withdraw,” Heidegger warns. Correct, calculative, objective understanding of particulars, though not sufficient for grasping the truth of existence, is potently useful, seductive, and distracting and induces complacency. This, says Heidegger, is “the supreme danger” of technology, a danger rooted in our overall indifference to every- thing that is not part of the standing-reserve. So long as we are chiefly inter- ested in things as means, as instruments, as standing-reserve, we inevitably come to a point where we take ourselves for standing-reserve. Then, ironically and monstrously, . . . precisely as the one so threatened, [man] exalts himself to the posture of the lord of the earth. In this way the illusion comes to prevail that everything man encounters exists only insofar as it is his construct. This illusion gives rise in turn to one final delusion: it seems as though man everywhere and always encounters only himself. . . . In truth, however, precisely nowhere does man today any longer encounter himself, i.e., his essence.

#### Extinction

Schulze-Makuch and Davies 2010 (Dirk Schulze-Makuch, Ph.D., School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, Washington State University and Paul Davies, Ph.D., Beyond Center, Arizona State University, “To Boldly Go: A One-Way Human Mission to Mars”, <http://journalofcosmology.com/Mars108.html>)

There are several reasons that motivate the establishment of a permanent Mars colony. We are a vulnerable species living in a part of the galaxy where cosmic events such as major asteroid and comet impacts and supernova explosions pose a significant threat to life on Earth, especially to human life. There are also more immediate threats to our culture, if not our survival as a species. These include global pandemics, nuclear or biological warfare, runaway global warming, sudden ecological collapse and supervolcanoes (Rees 2004). Thus, the colonization of other worlds is a must if the human species is to survive for the long term. The first potential colonization targets would be asteroids, the Moon and Mars. The Moon is the closest object and does provide some shelter (e.g., lava tube caves), but in all other respects falls short compared to the variety of resources available on Mars. The latter is true for asteroids as well. Mars is by far the most promising for sustained colonization and development, because it is similar in many respects to Earth and, crucially, possesses a moderate surface gravity, an atmosphere, abundant water and carbon dioxide, together with a range of essential minerals. Mars is our second closest planetary neighbor (after Venus) and a trip to Mars at the most favorable launch option takes about six months with current chemical rocket technology.

#### Managerialism is necessary to prevent global extinction –processes of environmental destruction are unstoppable without intervention

Dr Neil Levy 1999. Fellow of the Centre for Applied Philosophy and Public Ethics at Charles Sturt University. “Discourses of the Environment” p. 215

If the ‘technological fix’ is unlikely to be more successful than strategies of limitation of our uses of resources, we are nevertheless unable to simply leave the environment as it is. There is a real and pressing need for more, and more accurate, technical and scientific information about the non-human world. For we are faced with a situation in which the processes we have already set in train will continue to impact upon that world, and therefore us, for centuries. It is therefore necessary, not only to stop cutting down the rain forests, but to develop real, concrete proposals for action, to reverse, or at least limit, the effects of our previous interventions. More over, there is another reason why our behaviour towards the non-human cannot simply be a matter of leaving it as it is, at least in so far as our goals are not only environmental but also involve social justice. For if we simply preserve what remains to us of wilderness, of the countryside and of park land, we also preserve patterns of very unequal access to their resources and their consolations (Soper 1995: 207). In fact, we risk exacerbating these inequalities. It is no us, but the poor of Brazil, who will bear the brunt of the misery which would result form a strictly enforced policy of leaving the Amazonian rain forest untouched, in the absence of alternative means of providing for their livelihood. It is the development of policies to provide such ecologically sustainable alternative which we require, as well as the development of technical means for replacing our current greenhouse gas-emitting sources of energy. Such policies and proposals for concrete action must be formulated by ecologists, environmentalist, people with expertise concerning the functioning of ecosystems and the impacts which our actions have upon them. Such proposals are, therefore, very much the province for Foucault’s specific intellectual, the one who works ‘within specific sectors, at the precise points where their won conditions of life or work situate them’ (Foucault 1980g: 126). For who could be more fittingly described as ‘the strategists of life and death’ than these environmentalists? After the end of the Cold War, it is in this sphere, more than any other, that man’s ‘politics places his existence as a living being in question’ (Foucault 1976: 143). For it is in facing the consequences of our intervention in the non-human world that the fate of our species, and of those with whom we share this planet, will be decided.

#### Technological thought has been socialized, internalized, and can’t be eradicated

Leach 3

date page modified (Neil, Professor at the University of Southern California, “Forget Heidegger”, August 15, <http://www.china-designer.com/magazine/leach/txt1.htm>)

Adorno's further example of the car reveals how the **technological has come to colonise our everyday lives not as standing reserve, but as something to which symbolic intention is always already being 'attached'**. The point here is that we have to understand that our engagement with technology involves a moment of 'proprioception'. **Technology may come to operate as a form of 'prosthesis' to the human body that is appropriated such that it becomes part of the motility of the body**. In driving a car we come to navigate the road through that car. As such, the car as an item of technology is not divorced - alienated - from the body. Indeed it becomes a form of extension to that body. What I am arguing here is not some simplistic manifesto for cyborgs, claiming that human beings can become part human and part machine. Rather I am trying to tease out the logic of mimesis itself. For according to this logic, **human beings have absorbed technology at an unconscious level, such that they have come to operate through technology**, as though by way of some tele-kinesis.¶ Not only this, but **technology may actually influence the way that human beings think. It may itself affect our consciousness**. Let us take the example of the computer. For, if as Walter Benjamin once argued, the factory worker in the modernist age comes to absorb the jolting, jarring repetitive action of the machine, such that those movements are appropriated into the worker's own behaviour, so too people today have absorbed the thinking and fluid circuitry behind the computer screen. **New conditions breed new ways of thinking**. As Douglas Rushkoff observes, a new computer generation is emerging. The computer kids of today come to behave like their computers. They identify with them, play with them, and mimic their operations. Analogical reasoning is out. Non-linear, multiple-layered thinking is in - Deleuzian surfing. Fractals, rhizomes and clones, fluidity and flux - these are the buzz words of this new generation. In such a context, those who argue against the use of the computer in the contemporary design studio are failing to address the concrete ontological reality of life today, and are doing no service to the students, for whom knowledge of computer has become a 'given' within the contemporary office. It may be that the still prevalent **antipathy towards digital technology is merely a form of 'denial'**. As in the case of homophobics, who often deny their latent homosexuality, critics of technology may be repressing a secret fascination with technology. An individual 'in denial' may be fascinated by some personal psychic obsession, but, not wishing to acknowledge it, will project that obsession on to some external object, and then criticise it. But **whether this antipathy towards digital technology is a form of repressed fascination or not, it is clearly out of place in what has become a highly digitalised world**.¶ This is not to say that the computer should be accepted unproblematically within the studio. Indeed the lessons of those design schools that have accepted the computer wholesale would seem to indicate that the concerns expressed in The Anaesthetics of Architecture about the potential aestheticisation and hence anaesthetisation of social issues are borne out only too clearly in such contexts. Rather it is a call for a self-critical, theoretically informed engagement with such realms. Theory may be unable in itself to combat the potential problems of aestheticisation. Yet it may provide the first crucial step. **Once a problem has been exposed, one is no longer trapped by that problem.**¶ **The consequences are all too obvious. Not only have we accepted technology as an essential part of our everyday life, such that the distinction once posed between techné and technology seems no longer valid, but our whole existence has become conditioned by technology**. In this new digital age, as Sarah Chaplin argues, we have adopted a form of cybervisuality. An important factor, then, is our interface with that technology. For **technology may take many forms**. Here the question of design becomes crucial. The message of mimesis is not that human beings will adapt to anything, so that design is unimportant, but precisely the opposite. Design becomes an important mechanism for making people feel at one with their world. This relates not simply to whether a piece of technology is itself aesthetically pleasing - as is the case, say, with the iMac computer - , but in the context of digital technology it relates also to the user interface - to software programming and its compatibility with human modes of operation. **Far from engendering alienation, well designed technology has the capacity to overcome alienation**.¶ There was a time when Heideggerian thought made a substantial and noteworthy contribution to architectural culture in challenging the spirit of positivism that was once so pervasive. But now **Heideggerian thinking must not** itself **go unchallenged, in that it threatens to install itself as a set of fixed values out of tune with the fluidity and flux of contemporary society**. And while some would criticise postmodern thought for being relativistic in accommodating plurality and difference, and questioning the ground on which any particular statement is made, the true relativism lies surely in a tradition that forecloses even the possibility of even asking these questions, by doggedly adhering to an out of date set of values, and by failing to engage substantively with any critical discourse.¶ In an increasingly digital world, it is time, it would seem, to adopt a more flexible and tolerant attitude towards digital technology. It is time to break free from the shackles of the past. **It is time**, perhaps, **to forget Heidegger**.

### Solvency

#### Their attempt to use art as a metaphor for analyzing excess expenditures coopts any solvency because it is always rendered meaningless

Mann 95

Paul. Professor @ Pomona. “Stupid Undergrounds.” Postmodern Culture. May 1995

What animates the stupid underground is not merely heroic madness or libidinal ideology or a drooping IQ against reason, although we still have to listen to all of that repeated, precisely, past the point of endurance; it is something like stupid intelligence, the manic codification of the inane, the willingness to pursue, absolutely at the risk of abject humiliation, absolutely at the risk of making oneself a perfect fool, lines of inquiry that official intelligence would rather have shut down. The dismissal of some dubious scientific fact or method by official intelligence is taken as a clear sign that the powers that be are hiding something important, and that by this very means assumes the status of truth. Enormous labors will be devoted to unlocking its secrets and locating it in a worldview that is as logical as it is laughable, and that sustains the force of truth in large part by giving the lie to official truth. Reactive research, parody of science. Or of the mission of art and cultural commentary. Once it was crucial to separate high and low, art and kitsch, for the very good of the human spirit; then one tried to "transgress" these distinctions, without quite managing to get rid of them. But to copy comic books on vast canvases or laminate a few thriftshop tchotchkis and exhibit them in a major museum is not what used to be called a critical gesture, no matter what the catalogues say. It is not a critical reflection on the commodification of art, but a means of rendering the very distance required for such reflection null and void; not a "deconstruction" (sic) of the institution of art but the evacuation of criticism itself. In this zone, criticism is stupid, hence only stupidity can be critical. The illogic of this proposition cannot entirely eliminate its force. We are caught up in culture's inability to purge itself of the inanity utterly native to it. The patent stupidity of certain postmodern works of art, and of the commentary that tags along behind them, is a symptom of a virulent truth that infects everything and everyone, the holy blood of Van Gogh, Cezanne at his sublime labors, the Sistine Chapel englobing a void, empty frame after empty frame, vast libraries of special pleading, the whole dumb hollow of culture.

#### Aff gets commodified by the discursive economy of the debate space – takes out solvency

Mann 99

Paul. Professor of Literature @ Pomona. Masocriticism. Pp 3-4.

Now autopsies of the putative corpse of the avant-garde usually reveal a predictable etiology. In general, it seems the avant-garde died because it was unable to sustain its alterity, its difference, its otherness. It produced too many signs of the same and hence exhausted its credibility. The avant-grade died because all major forms of anti-art or aesthetic resistance end up in the very museums and cultural institutions that they began by calling into question; because the avant-garde insistence on innovation reduced itself to the most trivial market for novelties; because its attacks on tradition became tradition; because its attacks on the culture of the commodity only produced more cultural commodities; because it could not at one and the same time oppose mainstream culture and serve as its research and development agency; because anti-art succeeded despite itself in becoming Art; because, in short, the avant-garde continually turned itself into everything it denounced: fashion, commodities, high art, museum culture, Western civilization, bourgeois self-indulgence, and academic commentary. These are the causes or symptoms of the avant-garde’s fatality in the standard accounts. For the most part, I was more interested in what those accounts suggested about the perceived order of contemporary culture than in whether or not any one of them was, strictly speaking, true; but in any case let us accent them for the moment as a set of facts and garther them into another diagnosis: The avant-garde died of exposure. It died by revealing itself to its enemies. It put itself to death by continually articulating itself within the discursive economy of the cultures it claimed to subvert. It buried itself alive in the very manifestoes, events, collages, poems, and assemblages in which it proposed to live a disruptive and utopian existence. It died by putting itself in a position where people like me can appropriate it. it died of discourse. It talked, wrote, and painted itself to death.

## 2NC

### Framework

### AT We Meet

#### Restrictions on production must mandate a decrease in the quantity produced. Aff only reduces a regulation on production.

Anell 89 Chairman, WTO panel "To examine, in the light of the relevant GATT provisions, the matter referred to the CONTRACTING PARTIES by the United States in document L/6445 and to make such findings as will assist the CONTRACTING PARTIES in making the recommendations or in giving the rulings provided for in Article XXIII:2." 3. On 3 April 1989, the Council was informed that agreement had been reached on the following composition of the Panel (C/164): Composition Chairman: Mr. Lars E.R. Anell Members: Mr. Hugh W. Bartlett Mrs. Carmen Luz Guarda CANADA - IMPORT RESTRICTIONS ON ICE CREAM AND YOGHURT Report of the Panel adopted at the Forty-fifth Session of the CONTRACTING PARTIES on 5 December 1989 (L/6568 - 36S/68) http://www.wto.org/english/tratop\_e/dispu\_e/88icecrm.pdf

The United States argued that Canada had failed to demonstrate that it effectively restricted domestic production of milk. The differentiation between "fluid" and "industrial" milk was an artificial one for administrative purposes; with regard to GATT obligations, the product at issue was raw milk from the cow, regardless of what further use was made of it. The use of the word "permitted" in Article XI:2(c)(i) required that there be a limitation on the total quantity of milk that domestic producers were authorized or allowed to produce or sell. The provincial controls on fluid milk did not restrict the quantities permitted to be produced; rather dairy farmers could produce and market as much milk as could be sold as beverage milk or table cream. There were no penalties for delivering more than a farmer's fluid milk quota, it was only if deliveries exceeded actual fluid milk usage or sales that it counted against his industrial milk quota. At least one province did not participate in this voluntary system, and another province had considered leaving it. Furthermore, Canada did not even prohibit the production or sale of milk that exceeded the Market Share Quota. The method used to calculate direct support payments on within-quota deliveries assured that most dairy farmers would completely recover all of their fixed and variable costs on their within-quota deliveries. The farmer was permitted to produce and market milk in excess of the quota, and perhaps had an economic incentive to do so. 27. The United States noted that in the past six years total industrial milk production had consistently exceeded the established Market Sharing Quota, and concluded that the Canadian system was a regulation of production but not a restriction of production. Proposals to amend Article XI:2(c)(i) to replace the word "restrict" with "regulate" had been defeated; what was required was the reduction of production. The results of the econometric analyses cited by Canada provided no indication of what would happen to milk production in the absence not only of the production quotas, but also of the accompanying high price guarantees which operated as incentives to produce. According to the official publication of the Canadian Dairy Commission, a key element of Canada's national dairy policy was to promote self-sufficiency in milk production. The effectiveness of the government supply controls had to be compared to what the situation would be in the absence of all government measures.

#### Two types of solar – they don’t meet either

Glennon and Reeves ’10

(Robert Glennon \* and Andrew M. Reeves \*\*, \* Robert Glennon is the Morris K. Udall Professor of Law and Public Policy at the University of Arizona, Rogers College of Law. He is the author of Water Follies: Groundwater Pumping and the Fate of America's Fresh Waters (Island Press, 2002), and Unquenchable: America's Water Crisis And What To Do About It (Island Press, 2009). \*\* Andrew Reeves is a third-year student at the University of Arizona James E. Rogers College of Law and the 2009-2010 recipient of the Sol Resnick Water Resources Fellowship. “SOLAR ENERGY'S CLOUDY FUTURE” in Fall, 2010 Arizona Journal of Environmental Law & Policy, Lexis)

Water Use for Various Solar Technologies There are two basic kinds of solar power systems: photovoltaic cells (PV) and concentrating solar power (CSP). The first type, PV, converts solar radiation directly into electrical current. n32 On the upside, photovoltaic systems require a minimal amount of water (essentially to wash periodically the solar panels and operating equipment) and can be built in stages--a major incentive for private companies requiring short-term profitability. n33 Additionally, PV systems need not be built to utility scale. With continued improvement in "smart metering" and "smart grid" technology, private residents will continue to benefit from installing these solar panels while the owners of warehouses and urban commercial buildings may be able to install larger PV arrays on their rooftops to offset operational costs and create revenue by selling energy back to the grid. n34 On the downside, however, PV [\*97] systems present a major intermittency problem as PV cells are currently incapable of storing the energy they produce. n35 Thus, when the sun is absent, either from uncooperative weather or darkness, PV cells are largely ineffectual. The second type of utility-scale solar technology is CSP. A major advantage to CSP plants is their ability to address the intermittency problem that is such a liability for PV systems. Using thermal storage, hybridization with natural gas, or molten salts, CSP facilities can dispatch power to the grid even after the sun has set. n36 CSP plants employ four different approaches: solar trough; linear Fresnel; power tower; and dish/engine. n37 The first three use a steam cycle whereby an energy source is used to generate enough heat to boil water, to create exhaust steam, to spin a turbine that generates electricity. n38 These three CSP technologies operate like coal, natural gas, or nuclear plants with one exception--the CSP technologies use the sun's heat instead of coal, nuclear fuel, or natural gas to boil water and begin the generation process. n39 All power plants involving a steam cycle use water to create steam. This water is highly purified and continuously recycled. n40 The steam cycle begins when a heat source (here, concentrated sunlight) is applied, turning water into steam. The steam then turns the turbines, generating electricity. n41 After leaving the turbines, the steam is passed through a [\*98] condenser where it is cooled and condensed into liquid water. n42 This liquid water is then returned back to the heat source to begin the steam cycle once again. n43 Because the water in the steam cycle is continuously recycled, the amount of water consumed by the steam cycle itself is quite small. On the other hand, substantial quantities of water are generally used in the cooling cycle. n44 In most cooling cycles, cooling water is passed through the condenser where it picks up heat from the hot steam. The ultra-pure steam does not mix with the cooling water. n45 Rather, as the hot steam comes into contact with cool tubes of cooling water inside the condenser, the heat from the steam is transferred to the cooling water. n46 This heat transfer warms up the cooling water as it simultaneously cools and condenses the steam. n47 Appendix 1 shows diagrams of water-cooled solar power plants. In an "open-loop" cooling system, cooling water is passed through the condenser only once before being returned to the environment. n48 Large quantities of cooling water are removed from a river or other large body of water in an open-loop system. However, nearly all of that water is quickly returned, albeit at a higher temperature. n49 In a "closed-loop" cooling system, the cooling water is not returned to the environment but is recycled after passing through the condenser. Although the cooling water is recycled, significant quantities are lost with each turn of the cycle. This occurs for two reasons. First, before the cooling water can be reused, it must itself be cooled. In drier climates, this cooling generally occurs in large cooling towers, n50 where a significant portion of the water is intentionally evaporated to chill the water. n51 Much as the human body is cooled by sweat that evaporates from the skin, some of the cooling water must evaporate in order to cool the water that remains. A second reason why cooling water is lost in a closed-loop system has to do with the fact when water evaporates it leaves behind natural salts. n52 Left unchecked, these salts would reach concentrations so high that they would damage the equipment. In order to prevent such a problem from occurring, a portion of the cooling [\*99] water must be discharged from the cooling cycle (called "blowdown") and replaced with fresh water. n53 A third cooling system is air or "dry-cooling" which does not use any cooling water. Here, steam cools by transferring its heat through the walls of the condenser directly to the surrounding air. n54 The process is similar to a car's radiator which transfers heat to the air under the hood or (when the driver turns on the radiator) to the air in the passenger compartment of the vehicle. Although effective when ambient air temperatures are low (such as in the winter), air/dry-cooling is less efficient in the hot summer months--especially in desert areas where temperatures frequently exceed 120 degrees. n55 One power plant using air/dry-cooling technology was found to produce five percent less energy over the course of a year, thereby increasing the electricity cost seven to nine percent over a water-cooled plant. n56 Appendix 2 shows a diagram of a dry cooled solar power plant.

### 2NC State Action Good

#### And, scientific, rationalism is key to policymaking on energy and the environment. To be impactful, their social arguments should be mediated by our policymaking focus; not the other way around.

Fullwiler et. Al. 2k9

[scott t., wolfram elsner and tara natarajan, “the social fabric matrix approach to policy analysis: an introduction” in Institutional Analysis and Praxis: The Social Fabric Matrix approach”, 29-20,

Policymaking explains “an approach to policy analysis and planning that will allow us to¶ capture the complexity of the world around us and be consistent with modem science”¶ (p. 1; emphasis added). Thus, past and even current ongoing failures notwithstanding,¶ the premise here is that we know enough, care enough, and have adequate resources and¶ technology to solve our social, economic, and environmental problems. Or. stated differ-¶ ently, this book is optimistic by current standards of cynicism and pessimism. Our knowledge base is sufficient to do the research to understand our problems, our will is more than adequate, our work ethic is strong, our resources are abundant, and people are sufficiently educated to carry out the tasks in a technological society, (p. 2)¶ The shortcoming heretofore has been that “we have not had the analytical means necessary to meld our will, knowledge, and institutions into a policy paradigm that allows us to obtain success” (p. 2).¶ It is no small feat to design a method with such broad applicability as the SFM-A¶ has already demonstrated, particularly since to do so also requires a significant break¶ from previous dominant analytical paradigms that relied heavily upon reductionism and¶ determinism (i.e., noncomplexity). Instead, Hayden argues that, a new approach, if it is to be successful, must integrate modem science with an instrumentalist philosophy:¶ because we no longer believe that life—as structured in an institutional and ecological¶ milieu—is one dimensional, our measures and analytical tools cannot be one dimensional.¶ Because we no longer think that beliefs and values can be ignored, if for example, we want¶ successful irrigation systems or health care plans, an approach is needed to integrate what¶ sociologists and anthropologists know about beliefs and values with the expertise of engineers,¶ ecologists, agronomists, economists, physicians, and other expertise as needed for the problem¶ at hand. This integration can no longer be the kind that has persons working with different¶ expertise working in isolation, and their independent work then placed under one cover. The¶ analysis needs to be guided by a common model, or. to use Einstein’s term, a common frame.¶ 'The engineer’s work must be guided by belief criteria, the sociologists’ analysis should be¶ consistent with the relevant technology, the economists’ models need to be non-equilibrium¶ systems, policymakers’ actions are the results of integrated modeling, and so forth, (p. 1)¶ The editors and contributors to this volume suggest that the SFM-A provides not¶ only a powerful framework for policy research but also a framework that is com-¶ prehensive and adaptable to a wide variety of socioeconomic and policy issues.¶ Moreover, policy success obtained without such a complexity-reflecting analytical¶ approach will be coincidental.¶ In this chapter, we introduce the SFM-A by first discussing its theoretical under-¶ pinnings, then the SFM itself, and finally its larger paradigm for policy analysis.

### AT Language Not Exist in vaccumm

#### Dialogic meaning is still SOCIALLY grounded and thus FIXED

Lähteenmäki 4

Senior Researcher at University of Jyväskylä¶ <http://www.flt.uae.ac.ma/elhirech/baktine/140391690X%20-%20-%20Bakhtinian%20Perspectives%20on%20Language%20and%20Culture~%20Meaning%20in%20Language,%20Art%20and%20New%20.pdf>¶ Mika Lähteenmäki works as an Academy of Finland Postdoctoral¶ Researcher in the Department of Languages at the University of¶ Jyväskylä, Finland. His current research interests include the exegesis of¶ Bakhtin’s and Voloshinov’s works on language. He has written several¶ articles on the linguistic aspects of the works of Bakhtin and Voloshinov.

As the dialogical notion of meaning potential differs radically from the notion of literal meaning, it goes without saying that from the traditional, monologistic point of view **the notion of meaning potential may seem theoretically awkward**. **If meanings are not absolute**, invariant and identical for all the speakers, **it may seem that there is no way to make sense of the world** around us. The indeterminacy of meanings seems to lead to a situation in which there are as many possible meanings as there are situations. In other words, if one is not ready to accept the notion of literal meaning according to which there are absolute contextindependent meanings at the level of language system, **it may seem that the only alternative** **is to commit oneself to a relativistic ‘anything goes’ stance** according to which any expression can mean anything. **This** criticism, however, **can be seen as misguided**, since the basic assumption shared by Bakhtin, Voloshinov and Rommetveit is that the **meaning potential of a linguistic expression is inherently social** in its nature. The chief aim of this paper is to discuss the **dialogical** notion of **meaning** and to **argue against** **the view that** the notion of **meaning potential automatically implies a commitment to** an individualistic and **relativistic theory of meaning.** It is argued that the social nature of meaning potentials can be explicated by recontextualizing the **dialogical** approach to language and **communication** and considering it **from the viewpoint of ‘use-theory** of meaning’ **developed by Wittgenstein** in his Philosophical Investigations.2 The basic assumption is that meaning potentials are rooted in social practices of a given community and can be understood as properties that emerge from social activity. The main point is that, when interpreted within the framework of a ‘use-theory of meaning’, the **dialogical** notion of meaning potential can be given a definition which frees it from accusations of being relativistic, while, at the same time remaining, anti-essentialist and indeterministic in nature. To be more precise, **meaning potentials are** seen as being **emergent**3 by nature, which means they can be conceived of as **rules** which, on the one hand, function as resources for social and cultural practices and, on the other hand, are **(re)created via the actual rule-following behaviour.**

### 2NC Limits Good

#### Limits are a prerequisite to all of their arguments because they are necessary to give dialogue direction that’s Tonn in 5

#### Education – limits allows for predictable ground which a precondition to clash – that allows an actual discussion of a topical because both sides are ready to debate it – generates a key understanding of certain arguments

#### Research – absent limits, any argument can be read which makes for an impossible research burden on the negative which means that teams are forced to read their generics which makes for bad debates and rigs the game in favor of the aff

#### Echo Chamber DA - This rejection of structured clash makes debate into an echo chamber. This impoverishes their project even if it is right

Talisse 5

Professor of Philosophy @Vandy¶ Robert, Philosophy & Social Criticism, Deliberativist responses to activist challenges, 31(4) p. 429-431

The argument thus far might appear to turn exclusively upon different conceptions of what reasonableness entails. **The deliberativist view** I have sketched hold that reasonableness **involved some degree of** what we may call **epistemic modesty. On this** view, **the reasonable citizen seeks to have her beliefs reflect the best available reasons,** and so she enters into public discourse **as a way of testing her views against the objections** and questions of those who disagree; hence she implicitly hold that **her present view is open to reasonable critique** and that others who hold opposing views may be able to offer justifications for their views that are at least as strong as her reasons for her own. Thus any mode of **politics that presumes that discourse is extraneous to questions of justice and justification is unreasonable**. The activist sees no reason to accept this. Reasonableness **for the activist** consists in the ability to act on reasons that upon due reflection seem adequate to underwrite action; **discussion with those who disagree need not be involved**. **According to the activist,** there are certain cases in which he does in fact know the truth about what justice requires and in which **there is no room for reasoned objection.** Under such conditions, **the deliberativist’s demand for discussion can only obstruct justice; it is therefore irrational**. It may seem that we have reached an impasse. However, there is a further line of criticism that the activist must face. To the activist’s view that at least in certain situations he may reasonably decline to engage with persons he disagrees with (107), the deliberative democrat can raise the phenomenon that Cass Sunstein has called ‘group polarization’ (Sunstein, 2003; 2001A; ch. 3; 2001b: ch. 1). To explain: consider that political **activists cannot eschew deliberation altogether; they often engage in rallies,** demonstrations, teach-ins, workshops, and other activities in which they are called to make public the case for their views. **Activists** also **must engage in deliberation** among themselves when deciding strategy. Political movement must be organized, hence those involved must decide upon targets, methods, and tact’s; they must also decide upon the content of their pamphlets and the precise messages they most wish to convey to the press. **Often the audience in both of these deliberative contexts will be a self-selected and sympathetic group of like-minded activists**. **Group polarization** is a well-documented phenomenon that **has ‘been found all over the world** and is many diverse tasks’; it means that ‘members of a deliberating group predictably move towards a more extreme point in the direction indicated by’ predeliberation tendencies’ (Sunstein, 2003: 81-2). Importantly, **in group that ‘engage in repeated discussions’** over time, **the polarization is even more pronounced** (2003: 86). Hence discussion in a small but devoted activist enclave that meets regularly to strategize and protest ‘should produce a situation in which individuals hold positions more extreme than those of an individual member before the series of deliberations began’ (ibid.).17 The fact of group polarization is relevant to our discussion because the activist has proposed that **he may reasonably decline to engage in discussion with those with whom he disagrees** in cases in which the requirement of justice are so clear that he can be confidents that has the truth .Group polarization suggest that even deliberatively confronting those with whom we disagree is essential even we have the truth. **For even if we have the truth, if we do not engage opposing views,** but instead deliberate only with those with whom we agree, **our view will shift progressively to a more extreme point, and thus we lose the truth** ,In order to avoid polarization, deliberation must take place within heterogeneous ‘argument pools’ (Sunstein, 2003: 93). This of course does not mean that there should be no groups devoted to the achievement of some common political goal; it rather suggest that a engagement with

#### A limited topic discussion is key – Steinberg and Freely evidence says that providing predictable ground is a prerequisite to effective debate – when there is no clash, producing effective decisions becomes impossible – proven by the 2007 immigration debates – talking about warming, homelessness, or Bataille’s theory of energy production is interesting, but doesn’t establish a profitable for argument

### 2NC Switch Side Good

#### Switch side solves their offense

#### a) Debating both sides of an issue is critical to actual change - our Mitchell evidence gives empirical examples - the 2008 Water Wars debates held at the EPA headquarters in D.C. called upon policy debaters because of their ability to act as "honest brokers" - that gave voice to previously buried arguments - only deliberative debate can remove the polarization of current issues

#### b) Predictable ground – it’s necessary for meaningful switch-side debate – key to progressive politics

English et al 7

(Eric English, Stephen Lano, Gordon Mitchell, University of Pittsburgh communications professor, Catherine Morrison, John Reif, and Carly Woods, Schenley Park Debate Authors Working Group, “Debate as a Weapon of Mass Destruction,” June 2007, Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies, [www.pitt.edu/~gordonm/JPubs/EnglishDAWG.pdf](http://www.pitt.edu/~gordonm/JPubs/EnglishDAWG.pdf%5D), - Kurr)

The problem for Greene and Hicks is that this notion of citizenship becomes tied to a normative conception of American democracy that justifies imperialism. They write, ‘‘The production and management of this field of governance allows liberalism to trade in cultural technologies in the global cosmopolitan marketplace at the same time as it creates a field of intervention to transform and change the world one subject (regime) at a time.’’11 Here, Greene and Hicks argue that this new conception of liberal governance, which epitomizes the ethical citizen as an individual trained in the switch-side technique, serves as a normative tool for judging other polities and justifying forcible regime change. One need look only to the Bush administration’s framing of war as an instrument of democracy promotion to grasp how the switch-side technique can be appropriated as a justification for violence. It is our position, however, that rather than acting as a cultural technology expanding American exceptionalism, switch-side debating originates from a civic attitude that serves as a bulwark against fundamentalism of all stripes. Several prominent voices reshaping the national dialogue on homeland security have come from the academic debate community and draw on its animating spirit of critical inquiry. For example, Georgetown University law professor Neal Katyal served as lead plaintiff’s counsel in Hamdan, which challenged post-9/11 enemy combat definitions.12 The foundation for Katyal’s winning argument in Hamdan was laid some four years before, when he collaborated with former intercollegiate debate champion Laurence Tribe on an influential Yale Law Journal addressing a similar topic.13 Tribe won the National Debate Tournament in 1961 while competing as an undergraduate debater for Harvard University. Thirty years later, Katyal represented Dartmouth College at the same tournament and finished third. The imprint of this debate training is evident in Tribe and Katyal’s contemporary public interventions, which are characterized by meticulous research, sound argumentation, and a staunch commitment to democratic principles. Katyal’s reflection on his early days of debating at Loyola High School in Chicago’s North Shore provides a vivid illustration. ‘‘I came in as a shy freshman with dreams of going to medical school. Then Loyola’s debate team opened my eyes to a different world: one of argumentation and policy.’’ As Katyal recounts, ‘‘the most important preparation for my career came from my experiences as a member of Loyola’s debate team.’’14 The success of former debaters like Katyal, Tribe, and others in challenging the dominant dialogue on homeland security points to the efficacy of academic debate as a training ground for future advocates of progressive change. Moreover, a robust understanding of the switch-side technique and the classical liberalism which underpins it would help prevent misappropriation of the technique to bolster suspect homeland security policies. For buried within an inner-city debater’s files is a secret threat to absolutism: the refusal to be classified as ‘‘with us or against us,’’ the embracing of intellectual experimentation in an age of orthodoxy, and reflexivity in the face of fundamentalism. But by now, the irony of our story should be apparent\*the more effectively academic debating practice can be focused toward these ends, the greater the proclivity of McCarthy’s ideological heirs to brand the activity as a ‘‘weapon of mass destruction.’’

## 1NR

#### It was tech good

# Round 4 v JCCC CP

## 1NC

### 1NC

#### Cliff deal now but capital’s key

CSM 11-8

“Would Tea-Party Accept a Bill Clinton Brokered Deal with Obama?” <http://news.yahoo.com/tea-party-accept-bill-clinton-brokered-deal-obama-231119318.html>

Following the decisive victory by the man they vowed three-and-a-half years ago to pry out of the White House, the antigovernment tea party movement found itself reassessing its role within a fractured Republican Party that faced broad electoral disappointments on Election Day.¶ President Obama’s reelection represents the fifth time in the last six presidential cycles the Republican candidate has failed to win the popular vote. The GOP is now in full soul-searching mode, with the tea party especially facing criticism for its social and fiscal issue-driven co-opting of the Republican national agenda to which all contenders, including Mitt Romney, had to kneel during the primaries.¶ “In a lot of ways, the tea party movement was repudiated in the election,” says Joshua Dyck, a University of Massachusetts-Lowell political science professor and co-director of the Center for Public Opinion. “Part of the problem is that the tea party has had a hard time figuring out what it’s all about. Is it about Sarah Palin [social] conservatism or is the tea party about budget conservatism?”¶ Election 2012: 12 reasons Obama won and Romney lost¶ Yet tea party activists across the US also awoke Wednesday with the knowledge that their small government agenda still wields significant clout in the House, through which Obama must take any and all plans designed to raise taxes and slash a runaway deficit and mounting national debt.¶ Indeed, tea party activists – whose agenda has the approval of about a third of Americans – began quickly to sort through the electoral ashes, calibrating new ways to lead the GOP and achieve its chief goal – saving the republic from a looming calamity of fiscal profligacy.¶ “Defeat does not weaken the tea party,” says Brigitte Nacos, a political scientist at Columbia University who studies the GOP’s tea party splinter coalition. “The real topic is the tea party now, and it’s not only Republicans that have to deal with it, but also the president has to now deal with it.”¶ Yet given the country’s vote Tuesday, at least one tea party blogger suggested that studied compromise may have to replace the line-in-the-sand absolutism that left last year’s negotiations on the debt ceiling in bitter shambles and helped turn American opinion against the movement.¶ One suggestion floated by tea party members to break the fiscal gridlock would be to craft a spending deal similar to that struck by President Bill Clinton in 1997 – raising marginal tax rates across the board while slashing deficit spending. The tack, experts say, might allow a term-limited Obama to strike a substantial and meaningful across-the-aisle legislative deal to avoid potentially plunging the US into another recession.¶ Political scientists and tea party activists also suggested that such a deal could actually be brokered by the former president, as Professor Nocas says has been discussed, especially given Mr. Clinton’s 11th hour role on the Obama campaign trail.¶ “I definitely think it would behoove Obama to put Bill Clinton in charge of outreach, because Barack Obama frankly doesn’t know how to make a deal on the Hill,” says Scott Boston, a St. Louis-based tea party activist and blogger.¶ “The fact is, Bill Clinton’s budget was $1.2 trillion smaller than Obama’s budget, so, given that, though I’m not for higher taxes, I’m willing to trade a higher tax rate in return for $1.2 trillion in spending cuts,” Mr. Boston says. “Either way, we need to talk about the Clinton philosophy towards making the country go again, which was, ‘I’ll meet you on tax side if you meet on spending side.’ ”¶ “If they want to put that ’97 budget deal on the table, that sounds attractive to me,” says Matt Kibbe, the CEO of the anti-tax group Freedom Works and coauthor of “Give Us Liberty: A tea party manifesto.”¶ “It seems like there’s more pressure on the president,” says Kibbe. “We had a status quo election and the president must have known that this fiscal train wreck is coming, it’s there for everyone to see, and how is he going to lead in this situation? He’s not going to be able to demagogue the rich, because you could tax them at 100 percent and you couldn’t fix this problem.”¶ Indicating new Republican flexibility, House Speaker John Boehner (R) of Ohio said Wednesday that the GOP is open to discussing tax increases "under the right conditions" to get deficits under control.¶ Until now, Obama has pushed for more moderate deficit cuts offset by raising taxes on “the rich,” or couples making more than $250,000 a year. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the problem with Obama’s tack is that it doesn’t go far enough to reduce the deficit and the nation’s record $16 trillion debt in a significant way. The president has also refused to make deep cuts and reforms to social programs, as Republicans have demanded in their budgets.¶ A more likely scenario than Bill Clinton returning to the federal budget table is that establishment Republicans either have to maneuver the negotiations away from the House’s tea party coalition or force ultra-conservative members to bend into compromise – a tall order, suggests Professor Dyck, at the Center for Public Opinion.¶ “Can these people who have been lobbing bombs at each other, the president and the tea party, step away from the rhetorical campaign and come up with a negotiation on the fiscal cliff in about 16 days?” wonders Dyck. “I think the tea party is going to fight it kicking and screaming, because it is, ultimately, an ideologically pure movement.”¶ Indeed, moderate Republicans and right-leaning independents have argued that the tea party has pulled the GOP too far to the right while indulging out-of-the-mainstream scuttlebutt around Obama’s citizenship, racialized commentary, off-putting declarations about rape and women’s bodies, and xenophobic immigration talk.¶ But while there’s truth to those assertions, Tea Party Patriots co-founder Mark Meckler told The Boston Globe on Tuesday that the tea party’s impact has been far more profound than that.¶ “President Obama was forced in the debates to call himself the president of reining in big government. That was unthinkable four years ago,” Mr. Meckler said. “The entire nature of the debate in the United States has changed because of the tea party movement.”¶ National Review Online columnist Michael Tanner suggests the reelection of vice presidential candidate Paul Ryan back to the House (even as Wisconsin overall leaned to Obama) suggests that the core tea party message – smaller, less expensive central government – still resonates.¶ According to exit polls Tuesday, some 51 percent of voters say government already does too much, versus 44 percent who believe the government should do more.¶ “It’s important that Democratic efforts to turn the Ryan budget and Medicare into a bludgeon failed,” writes Mr. Tanner. “Democratic gains in the House were negligible; nearly all Republicans who voted for the Ryan budget were reelected,” and Romney fought Obama to a draw on Medicare issues in Florida.¶ The GOP’s civil war between moderates and small government tea party insurgents may come into focus quickly, and burn brightly, suggests Ms. Nacos. Yet Obama will hardly be able to stand idly by, enjoying the show, she adds.¶ “We will see very quickly with a lot of important issues in Congress whether there is less or more influence of the tea party, but this also depends what the Obama administration and Democrats do,” she says.¶ “The president really has to use his political capital the right way,” she adds, “and he now has an opportunity to be a better communicator, to explain to the public what is at stake and why things are not being done.”

#### Plan kills Obama capital

Petroleum Intelligence Weekly, 1/9

Obama Plays Safe on Energy Policy, 2012 Lexis

With less than a year to go until he faces re-election, US President Barack Obama is trying to avoid controversial energy policy decisions, postponing the finalization of restrictions on oil refinery and power plant emissions and delaying the approval of a major crude pipeline project. The president’s caution will prolong the status quo on issues where the industry both opposes and supports the administration’s plans, and also illustrates what's at stake for energy policy depending on whether or not Obama is given another four years in office. Most of Obama's original campaign pledges on promoting alternatives to fossil fuels and tackling climate change have not passed muster with Congress, most notably an ambitious plan for national carbon controls, a subsequent toned-down clean energy standard floated after the carbon legislation failed, and repeated efforts to repeal $30 billion-$40 billion worth of oil industry tax deductions over 10 years ( PIW May9'11 ). The one exception has been the passage of $90 billion in clean energy funding as part of an economic stimulus bill passed early in Obama's term, but the White House has been unable to repeat this success in other energy policy areas ( PIW Feb.23'09 ).

#### That causes a depression

Morici 8/7

Peter, PhD, is a "recognized expert on economic policy and international economics." He is a Professor of International Business at the R.H. Smith School of Business at the University of Maryland. "Fix fiscal cliff now or face next Great Depression," 2012, <http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/08/07/fix-fiscal-cliff-now-or-face-next-great-depression/>

President Obama and Republicans are engaging in dangerous brinksmanship. Putting off a political solution to the looming “fiscal cliff” until after the election risks a second Great Depression.¶ Without a compromise by January, $400 billion in mandatory spending cuts and more than $100 billion in tax increases will immediately go into effect. With our economy only growing by only $300 billion annually, such a shock would thrust it into a prolonged contraction.

#### Decline causes war

Kemp 10

Geoffrey Kemp, Director of Regional Strategic Programs at The Nixon Center, served in the White House under Ronald Reagan, special assistant to the president for national security affairs and senior director for Near East and South Asian affairs on the National Security Council Staff, Former Director, Middle East Arms Control Project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2010, The East Moves West: India, China, and Asia’s Growing Presence in the Middle East, p. 233-4

The second scenario, called Mayhem and Chaos, is the opposite of the first scenario; everything that can go wrong does go wrong. The world economic situation weakens rather than strengthens, and India, China, and Japan suffer a major reduction in their growth rates, further weakening the global economy. As a result, energy demand falls and the price of fossil fuels plummets, leading to a financial crisis for the energy-producing states, which are forced to cut back dramatically on expansion programs and social welfare. That in turn leads to political unrest: and nurtures different radical groups, including, but not limited to, Islamic extremists. The internal stability of some countries is challenged, and there are more “failed states.” Most serious is the collapse of the democratic government in Pakistan and its takeover by Muslim extremists, who then take possession of a large number of nuclear weapons. The danger of war between India and Pakistan increases significantly. Iran, always worried about an extremist Pakistan, expands and weaponizes its nuclear program. That further enhances nuclear proliferation in the Middle East, with Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and Egypt joining Israel and Iran as nuclear states. Under these circumstances, the potential for nuclear terrorism increases, and the possibility of a nuclear terrorist attack in either the Western world or in the oil-producing states may lead to a further devastating collapse of the world economic market, with a tsunami-like impact on stability. In this scenario, major disruptions can be expected, with dire consequences for two-thirds of the planet’s population.

### 1NC

#### THE AFFIRMATIVE’S STRATEGY OF ENERGY SECURITIZATION EMPIRICALLY FAILS TO MOTIVATE SUCCESSFUL ACTION AND BECOMES A SELF-FULFILLING PROPHECY

Ahmed 11

Dr. Nafeez Mosaddeq Ahmed is Executive Director of the Institute for Policy Research and Development (IPRD), an independent think tank focused on the study of violent conflict, he has taught at the Department of International Relations, University of Sussex "The international relations of crisis and the crisis of international relations: from the securitisation of scarcity to the militarisation of society" Global Change, Peace & Security Volume 23, Issue 3, 2011 Taylor Francis

The twenty-ﬁrst century heralds the unprecedented acceleration and convergence of multiple, interconnected global crises – climate change, energy depletion, food scarcity, and economic instability. While the structure of global economic activity is driving the unsustainable depletion of hydrocarbon and other natural resources, this is simultaneously escalating greenhouse gas emissions resulting in global warming. Both global warming and energy shocks are impacting detrimentally on global industrial food production, as well as on global ﬁnancial and economic instability. Conventional policy responses toward the intensiﬁcation of these crises have been decidedly inadequate because scholars and practitioners largely view them as separate processes. Yet increasing evidence shows they are deeply interwoven manifestations of a global political economy that has breached the limits of the wider environmental and natural resource systems in which it is embedded. In this context, orthodox IR’s ﬂawed diagnoses of global crises lead inexorably to their ‘securitisation’, reifying the militarisation of policy responses, and naturalising the proliferation of violent conﬂicts. Global ecological, energy and economic crises are thus directly linked to the ‘Otherisation’ of social groups and problematisation of strategic regions considered pivotal for the global political economy. Yet this relationship between global crises and conﬂict is not necessary or essential, but a function of a wider epistemological failure to holistically interrogate their structural and systemic causes. In 2009, the UK government’s chief scientiﬁc adviser Sir John Beddington warned that without mitigating and preventive action ‘drivers’ of global crisis like demographic expansion, environmental degradation and energy depletion could lead to a ‘perfect storm’ of simultaneous food, water and energy crises by around 2030. 1 Yet, for the most part, conventional policy responses from national governments and international institutions have been decidedly inadequate. Part of the problem is the way in which these crises are conceptualised in relation to security. Traditional disciplinary divisions in the social and natural sciences, compounded by bureaucratic compartmentalisation in policy-planning and decision-making, has meant these crises are frequently approached as largely separate processes with their own internal dynamics. While it is increasingly acknowledged that cross-disciplinary approaches are necessary, these have largely failed to recognise just how inherently interconnected these crises are. As Brauch points out, ‘most studies in the environmental security debate since 1990 have ignored or failed to integrate the contributions of the global environmental change community in the natural sciences. To a large extent the latter has also failed to integrate the results of this debate.’ 2 Underlying this problem is the lack of a holistic systems approach to thinking about not only global crises, but their causal origins in the social, political, economic, ideological and value structures of the contemporary international system. Indeed, it is often assumed that these contemporary structures are largely what need to be ‘secured’ and protected from the dangerous impacts of global crises, rather than transformed precisely to ameliorate these crises in the ﬁrst place. Consequently, policy-makers frequently overlook existing systemic and structural obstacles to the implementation of desired reforms. In a modest effort to contribute to the lacuna identiﬁed by Brauch, this paper begins with an empirically-oriented, interdisciplinary exploration of the best available data on four major global crises – climate change, energy depletion, food scarcity and global ﬁnancial instability – illustrating the systemic interconnections between different crises, and revealing that their causal origins are not accidental but inherent to the structural failings and vulnerabilities of existing global political, economic and cultural institutions. This empirical evaluation leads to a critical appraisal of orthodox realist and liberal approaches to global crises in international theory and policy. This critique argues principally that orthodox IR reiﬁes a highly fragmented, de-historicised ontology of the international system which underlies a reductionist, technocratic and compartmentalised conceptual and methodological approach to global crises. Consequently, rather than global crises being understood causally and holistically in the systemic context of the structure of the international system, they are ‘securitised’ as ampliﬁers of traditional security threats, requiring counter-productive militarised responses and/or futile inter-state negotiations. While the systemic causal context of global crisis convergence and acceleration is thus elided, this simultaneously exacerbates the danger of reactionary violence, the problematisation of populations in regions impacted by these crises and the naturalisation of the consequent proliferation of wars and humanitarian disasters. This moves us away from the debate over whether resource ‘shortages’ or ‘abundance’ causes conﬂicts, to the question of how either can generate crises which undermine conventional socio-political orders and confound conventional IR discourses, in turn radicalising the processes of social polarisation that can culminate in violent conﬂict.

#### SECURITIZING ENERGY SCARCITY FAILS AND CAUSES MORE LONG-TERM DESTRUCTION AND MILITARY CONFLICT. UNIQUELY TURNS THE CASE.

Ahmed 2k11

[nafeez mosaddeq, department of ir at university of essex, “the international relations crisis and the crisis of international relations: from the securitization of scarcity to the militarization of society”, Executive Director of the Institute for Policy Research and Development, an independent think tank focused on the study of violent conflict in the context of global ecological, energy and economic crises, global change, peace and security, vol 23, no 3, October]

In one salient example, O’Keefe draws extensively on both offensive and defensive variants of neorealist theory, including the work of Jack Snyder, Robert Jervis and Kenneth Waltz, to argue for realism ’s continuing relevance in understanding how the biophysical environment plays a signiﬁcant role in triggering and prolonging the structural conditions that result in conﬂict. She notes that standard realist concepts such as ‘anarchy, security dilemmas, and the prisoner ’s dilemma can be used to explain the emergence of environmental or resource-based violent conﬂicts largely within, and occasionally between, the weaker states of the South. Environmental anarchy occurs in weak states which lack active government regulation of the internal distribution of natural resources, leading to a tragedy of the commons. This generates resource scarcities which lead to security dilemmas over ownership of resources, often settled by resort to violence, perpetuated by the prisoner’s dilemma. Ultimately, this theoretical hypothesis on the causes of environmental or resource-related conﬂict is incapable of engaging with the deeper intersecting global structural conditions generating resource scarcities, independently of insufﬁcient government management of the internal distribution of resources in weak states. It simplistically applies the Hobbesian assumption that without a centralized Leviathan state structure, the persistence of anarchy in itself generates conﬂict over resources. Under the guise of restoring the signiﬁcance of the biophysical environment to orthodox IR, this approach in effect actually occludes the environment as a meaningful causal factor, reducing it to a mere epiphenomenon of the dynamics of anarchy in the context of state failure. As a consequence, this approach is theoretically impotent in grasping the systemic acceleration of global ecological, energy and economic crises as a direct consequence of the way in which the inter-state system itself exploits the biophysical environment. The same criticism in fact applies to opposing theories that resource abundance is a major cause of violent conﬂict. Bannon and Collier, for instance, argue that resource abundance and greed, rather than resource scarcity and political grievances, generated intra-state conﬂicts ﬁnanced by the export of commodities in regions like Angola and Sierra Leone (diamonds) or West Africa (tropical timber). In other regions, abundance rather than shortages of oil, drugs and gold fuelled and ﬁnanced violent secessionist movements in the context of widespread corruption and poor governance. Ultimately, this departs little from the theoretical assumptions above with weak central state governance still blamed for generating anarchic conditions conducive to conﬂict over abundant resources. Furthermore as Kaldor shows this simplistic perspective overlooks the wider context of the global political economy–the evolution of regional ‘war economies’ was often enabled precisely by the devastating impact of neoliberal structural adjustment programmes which eroded state structures and generated social crises that radicalized identity politics.58Under traditional neorealist logic a strategic response to global environmental crises must involve the expansion of state-military capabilities in order to strengthen the centralised governance structures whose task is to regulate the international distribution of natural resources as well as to ensure that a particular state’s own resource requirements are protected. Neorealism under-stands inter-state competition rivalry and warfare as inevitable functions of states’ uncertainty about their own survival arising from the anarchic structure of the international system. Gains for one state are losses for another and each state’s attempt to maximise its power relative to all other states is simply a reﬂection of its rational pursuit of its own security. The upshot is the normalisation of political violence in the international system including practices such as over-exploitation of energy and the environment as a ‘rational’ strategy–even though this ultimately ampliﬁes global systemic insecurity. Inability to cooperate internationally and for mutual beneﬁt is viewed as an inevitable outcome of the simple axiomatic existence of multiple states. The problem is that neorealism cannot explain in the ﬁrst placethe complex interdependence and escalation of global crises. Unable to situate these crises in the context of an international system that is not simply a set of states but a transnational global structure based on a speciﬁc exploita-tive relationship with the biophysical environment neorealism can only theorise global crises as‘new issue areas’appended to already existing security agendas.59Yet by the very act of projecting global crises as security threats neorealism renders itself powerless to prevent or mitigate them by theorising their root structural causes. In effect despite its emphasis on the reasons why states seek security neorealism ’s approach to issues like climate change actually guarantees greater insecurity by promoting policies which frame these ‘non-traditional’ issues purely as ampliﬁers of quite traditional threats. As Susanne Peters argues the neorealist approach renders the militarisation of foreign and domestic policy a pragmatic and necessary response to issues such as resource scarcities–yet in doing so it entails the inevitable escalation of ‘resource wars’ in the name of energy security. Practically this serves not to increase security for competing state and non-state actors but to debilitate inter-national security through the proliferation of violent conﬂict to access and control diminishing resources in the context of unpredictable complex emergencies.60Neorealism thus negates its own theoretical utility and normative value. For if ‘security ’is the fundamental driver of state foreign policies then why are states chronically incapable of effectively ameliorating the global systemic ampliﬁers of ‘insecurity despite the obvious rationale to do so in the name of warding off collective destruction if not planetary annihilation?

#### THE ALTERNATIVE IS TO REJECT THE AFF.

#### THE 1AC’S SECURITIZING PERFORMANCE OF ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT ENSURES LONG-TERM ENVIRONMENTAL DESTRUCTION BY ORGANIZING IT AS A PROBLEM TO BE SOLVED BY INTERESTED ACTORS. THE ALT IS AN ACT OF RE-WRITING ECOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS BEYOND SECURITY’S DESTRUCTIVE FRAMEWORK

Cudworth and Hobden 2k10

[Erika and Stephen professors university of east London securing what for whom? Multiple complex inequalities and the politics of environmental security in Europe European Consortium for Political Research]

A full discussion of the concepts that underlie the notion of complex ecology is developed in our forthcoming book on the environment and/in international relations (Cudworth and Hobden 2011). Here we point to the main features of such an approach. A complexity-inspired approach to environmental issues in international relations would constitute a distinct form of analysis compared to ‘environmental conflict’ and ‘environmental security’ approaches. Such an approach gives priority to developing an understanding of social political and economic relations as impacting beyond the human. While human and non‐human systems have distinct features ultimately they are co‐constitutive overlapping and intersected. Rather than seeing a separation between the human and the non‐human complex ecologism sees the human world as embedded within the natural world with the variety of human social systems intersecting with those of other natural systems. Varied social systems overlap and intersect with resulting implications for a range of other natural systems (species scapes and the wider biosphere). The notion of panarchy described in the previous section provides an effective depiction of the sets of inter‐relating systems. There are a few attempts to deploy complexity in ‘ecological security approaches’. Harrison for example identifies ‘four principle concepts of complexity adapted to ecological systems’: adaptive agency self‐organizing emergence authority and openness’ (2006: 55). There are two major difficulties with Harrison’s application of complexity concepts: dualism and0 the eliding of power relations. Harrison discusses the concept of agency entirely in relation to the subjectivity and adaptation strategies of human beings in the context of environmental change. Second in his discussions of self‐organisation and emergence he stresses the bottom‐up interconnections and processes for example in environmental policy making. In Harrison’s interconnected non‐linear systems natural and social systems are analytically separate and politics is lost – there is no understanding of power in the social world here or its impact on non‐human systems. Whilst ‘ecological security’ firmly places the analysis of political social and economic relations within the global environmental system and pays attention to regional differences it does not account for the full range of complex social inequalities that shape human relations with and within environments. The contribution of a complex ecology approach is the potential to analyse intersectionality and multiple power relations. As discussed above a variety of different sets of power relations have been analysed by political ecologists. These represent the operation of different sets of systems such as patriarchal capitalist ethnocentrist and so on which can have an impact on each other and have implications for the environment. We would argue that while these can be considered as distinct systems the development path of each has implications for other systems. This allows for the development of multiple levels of analysis drawing the focus away from the state to supra‐state levels (including the biosphere) and sub‐state levels. Environmental issues can therefore be analysed operating at a variety of levels. Complex ecologism provides a means of overcoming the weaknesses in the range of environmental securitization approaches as discussed in the first section of this paper. By moving away from a state focussed framework and considering a panarchy of inter‐linked systems environmental problems can be considered at global regional and local levels. The biosphere itself is asystem co‐constitutive with other human and non‐human systems.Envisioning human systems embedded within a wider range of systems overcomes the duality inherent in the majority of approaches to understanding environmental issues within international relations. The environment is not “out there” but instead constitutive of and reactive to human systems. Human systems are embedded within a number of non‐human systems with the consequence that developments in one system mayhave implications elsewhere in the panarchy. Thus as a simple exampleincreased carbon dioxide levels as a result of increased industrialisation can be linked to species migration in local ecological systems. Likewise global temperature rises can increase energy use for example to run cooling systems impacting across economic (oil prices) political (inter‐state relations) and ethnic systems (relations with Islamic European populations)1 The interlinking of complex systems also allows the analysis to shiftfrom a focus on security to one of insecurity. Complex ecologism understandsinteractions and changes in complex human/natural systems as resulting in multiple risks hazards and uncertainties which international politics mustnavigate. A significant feature of current global environmental issues is thatmany of those most in a situation of risk are not the authors of the causes ofthat risk. Environmental risk situations faced by individuals communities and societies are frequently the consequences of complex power inter‐ relationships. More developed societies have been effective at exporting their environmental degradation gaining the benefits of industrial production without the inherent costs. Finally by focussing on the intersection of power relations operating in and between different systems and the creation of risk that is associated with relations between systems the possibilities for a mitigation of risk throughout the panarchy become the key issue. The move from ‘security’ to ‘risk alleviation’ implies that the focus of attention is on the restructuring of risk creating activities rather than attempts to secure protection for specific groups. By breaking the link between this as a state-focussed issue and instead a concentration on an analysis focussed on intersecting systems removes the focus on particular social groups and re-orientates the analysis towards both a concern for the wider biosphere and social justice. As manyothers have pointed out work on environmental change in international relations theory has tended to modify existing approaches by including the environment in pre‐existing frameworks such as securitization. Perspectives such as ‘ecological security’ which attempt a radical questioning and transformation of that framework are still shaped by it. We need to move beyond securitization but in policy terms it seems the notion of security has been attractive and it frames environmental policies alongside initiatives for ‘mitigation’ of and ‘adaptation’ to environmental ‘problems’.

### 1NC

#### **Text: The USFG should abandon the waste confidence rule except for tritium disposal, remove the mandate that specific nuclear technologies be wedded to specific plant design, and pass legislation voiding the part of Jimmy Carter’s Presidential Directive 8 that indefinitely defers the commercial reprocessing and recycling of plutonium in the United States.**

#### **Waste Confidence Rule applies to tritium production--- should keep that rule in place for tritium**

Galloway 12

[Anne, <http://vtdigger.org/2012/08/14/nuclear-regulatory-commission-puts-halt-to-nuclear-power-licensing-decisions/>, mg]

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission last week suspended all nuclear power licensing decisions until it can address environmental concerns regarding long-term storage of nuclear waste.¶ The ruling puts a halt to license renewal applications for nine plants, including Indian Point in New York and Seabrook in New Hampshire.¶ Under the order, the commission, for the first time, will require environmental assessments of nuclear waste now held at the nation’s 104 reactor sites.¶ The decision comes in the wake of a June 8 U.S. Appellate Court ruling that struck down two key provisions of a so-called “waste confidence rule” and growing public pressure to evaluate the potential hazards of spent fuel pools and dry cask storage at nuclear reactor sites in the United States in the aftermath of the Fukushima nuclear disaster in Japan. There are 104 nuclear reactors at 64 operating plants in the United States, according to a report from CNN. Half are more than 30 years old.¶ Diane Curran, an attorney representing some of the groups in the Court of Appeals case, said: “This commission decision halts all final licensing decisions — but not the licensing proceedings themselves — until NRC completes a thorough study of the environmental impacts of storing and disposing of spent nuclear fuel. That study should have been done years ago, but NRC just kept kicking the can down the road. When the Federal Appeals Court ordered NRC to stop and consider the impacts of generating spent nuclear fuel for which it has found no safe means of disposal, the agency could choose to appeal the decision by August 22nd or choose to do the serious work of analyzing the environmental impacts over the next few years. With today’s commission decision, we are hopeful that the agency will undertake the serious work.”¶ What the NRC’s decision means for the 40-year-old Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Plant in Vernon is unclear. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission renewed the plant’s license to operate for an additional 20 years in March 2011, weeks after a tsunami led to the meltdown of three nuclear reactors in Japan. Vermont Yankee is a Mark 1 General Electric boiling water reactor, identical to the models used in Japan.¶ No one interviewed for this story said Vermont Yankee’s relicensure case would be re-evaluated by the NRC. Several sources suggested the commission’s new requirement for environmental assessment of waste storage could have an impact on the Vermont Public Service Board’s pending consideration of a certificate of public good for the plant.¶ Entergy Corp. is seeking state approval for a 20-year license to operate the plant. At the same time, the Louisiana company is suing the state over the Legislature’s 2010 vote to deny Entergy an opportunity to seek a certificate of public good from the board. Lawmakers cited the deteriorating condition of the plant (a cooling tower collapse in 2007 and tritium leaks in 2010) and misstatements by corporation officials as reasons for withholding approval. Gov. Peter Shumlin, a Democrat who spearheaded the state Senate vote, is named in the Entergy lawsuit.

### 1NC

#### No domestic source for US tritium production

Politico 10/15/12

[Darren Goode, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1012/82430.html?hp=r5>, mg]

**A struggling uranium enrichment company** that has won friends among some of Congress’s most powerful Republicans can count a new GOP name in its corner: Mitt Romney.¶ Romney this weekend came out in support of the company, USEC, which has been trying to land more than $2 billion in federal assistance for its embattled American Centrifuge Project in Piketon, Ohio.¶ While being vague about exactly what kind of aid — if any — he’d favor for USEC, Romney echoed the arguments of company supporters that its uranium enrichment work is crucial to both national and energy security.¶ “America must have a reliable source of domestically produced uranium, enriched uranium,” Romney said at a campaign stop Saturday in Portsmouth, Ohio, according to The Los Angeles Times. “We need to make sure that **Piketon** has the most modern technology so that we can provide that source of security for our great country.”¶ It was the first time Romney has expressed support for the company, which **remains in financial peril** even with continued infusions of federal aid. The company has gotten crucial backing from President Barack Obama’s Energy Department, and lawmakers championing its cause have included House Speaker John Boehner and Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell — along with home-state Democrats like Sen. Sherrod Brown.¶ While he was light on specifics, Romney’s words Saturday fit a pattern in which leading Republicans have favored efforts to keep USEC afloat even as they accuse the Obama administration of “picking winners and losers” by financing green energy companies like Solyndra. Just two months ago, Romney’s energy blueprint called for continuing the Environmental Protection Agency’s renewable fuel mandate for ethanol, which has likewise run afoul of some Republican free-market purists.¶ Romney’s campaign said Monday that the GOP nominee is not endorsing the sort of government energy favoritism that he accuses Obama of embracing.¶ “Mitt Romney believes **it is vital that the United States have a secure source of tritium** for our scientific, healthcare, and military needs,” Romney’s campaign said in a statement. “He is committed to ensuring that any loan guarantee proposal be carefully reviewed to determine if government support is the best way to protect the national interest. Unlike President Obama, he will not make empty promises, play politics with these issues, or employ the sort of cronyism that rewards big donors and leaves taxpayers with nothing but the bill.”

#### Plan causes new tritium production

Beyond Nuclear ‘10

[“Tritium Fact Sheet.”, March, <http://www.beyondnuclear.org/storage/documents/Tritiumbasicinfofinal.pdf>, mg]

Tritium is a radioactive isotope of hydrogen. It is generated in nuclear power reactors and is released to the environment in water and air. It cannot be filtered. Releases have been occur- ring since the 1960s when power reactors began to come online. Releases continue as reactors age and components degrade, contaminating air, water and soil. The radiation emitted from nuclear power facilities is categorized as “ionizing radiation” because it can break the chemical bonds of its target that could be a human cell or protein or other biological substance basic to life.¶ ¶ What is Tritium?¶ • Tritium (3H) releases ionizing radiation in the form of a beta particle.1 • Tritium is a byproduct of nuclear power reactors, which can release thousands of curies¶ or more of tritium every year.2 • Tritium has a half-life of 12.3 years. This means it will be dangerous for at least 120¶ years, since the hazardous life of a radioactive isotope is ten to twenty times its half-¶ life.3 • No economically feasible technology exists that can remove tritium from a reactor’s¶ waste water that is released to the river, lake, or ocean that provides the reactor’s cooling water. And no economically feasible technology exists to remove tritium from the reactor’s gaseous and steam releases to the air. Therefore, every nuclear reactor releases tritium as a part of its routine operation and not just as the result of accidental leaks or spills.¶

#### **Crushes US nonproliferation leadership and causes global nuclear wars**

Bergeron 02

[Kenneth, Formerly of the Sandia National Laboratories, Author; *Tritium on Ice: The Dangerous New Alliance of Nuclear Weapons and Nuclear Power,* MIT Press, 2002, p.173]

In the worst case, even if such redirection of policy does not occur and tritium is finally produced at Watts Bar or Sequoyah, the compromise to the U.S. nonproliferation posture might still be mitigated. Given the sharp reductions in the nuclear arsenals now planned by the Bush administration, the nuclear weapons complex will by then be awash in tritium recovered from nuclear warheads removed from the active stockpile. If any sanity prevails when TVA tritium becomes available, perhaps a renewed commitment to the principle of isolating civilian nuclear power from nuclear weapons work could be demonstrated simply by segregating the TVA-produced tritium from the military inventory. By abstaining from the use of this tritium in nuclear weapons, the United States might salvage some shred of symbolism about its nonproliferation stance. The sad thing is that even such a feeble gesture would probably encounter opposition from nuclear warriors in the U.S. government, people who have developed an eerie kind of bureaucratic bravado about nuclear weaponry, confusing as wisdom their own desensitization to the dangers of nuclear war. Managing the risk of nuclear war is surely one of the greatest challenges the United States faces in the twentieth century, and it will continue to be so in the twenty-first. But the nature of the challenge has changed, and an adequate response will be impossible if overall directions and specific decisions are left to the professionals and experts in the nuclear weapons enterprise. The real experts on the best interests of the nation are its citizens and their representatives. Without their informed and active involvement, the risk is high that instead of experiencing a peaceful and prosperous future, the nation and the world will be ravaged and unraveled by pointless and avoidable nuclear conflicts.

### WATER

#### SMRs collapse IAEA efficacy—impact is accidents

Edwin Lyman, Ph.D., Senior Scientist, Global Security Program Union of Concerned Scientists, 7/14/11, “An Examination of the Safety and Economics of Light Water Small Modular Reactors”, http://www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/nuclear\_power/lyman-appropriations-subcom-7-14-11.pdf

Fukushima also demonstrated how rapidly a nuclear reactor accident can progress to a core meltdown if multiple safety systems are disabled. A well-planned and executed terrorist attack could cause damage comparable to or worse than the earthquake and tsunami that initiated the Fukushima crisis, potentially in even less time. And although Osama bin Laden is gone, the terrorist threat to domestic infrastructure may actually increase over time if al Qaeda seeks to retaliate. This is the wrong time to consider reducing security requirements for nuclear power plants, regardless of their size. However, SMR vendors have emphasized that reducing security staffing is critical for the economic viability of their projects. Christofer Mowry of B&W told the NRC in March that “whether SMRs get deployed in large numbers or not is going to come down to O&M [operations and maintenance]. And the biggest variable that we can attack directly ... is the security issue.” A Nuclear Energy Institute representative said in a presentation in June that “optimal security staffing levels [for SMRs] may appreciably differ from current levels.”¶ UCS is also concerned that reducing safety and security requirements for SMRs could facilitate their sale to utilities or other entities in the United States and abroad that do not have prior experience with nuclear power. Some SMR vendors argue that their technology is so safe that it can be deployed to remote areas, military bases, and countries in the developing world that have relatively low electric demand and no nuclear experience or emergency planning infrastructure. However, SMRs deployed in this manner could raise additional safety and security concerns compared to their deployment by established and experienced nuclear utilities.¶ The distributed deployment of small reactors would also put great strains on existing licensing and inspection resources. Nuclear reactors are qualitatively different from other types of generating facilities, not least because they require a much more extensive safety and security inspection regime. Similarly, deployment of individual small reactors at widely distributed and remote sites around the world would strain the resources of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and its ability to adequately safeguard reactors to guard against proliferation, since IAEA inspectors would need to visit many more locations per installed megawatt around the world. Maintaining robust oversight over vast networks of SMRs around the world would be difficult, if feasible at all.¶ UCS believes that SMRs are only suitable for deployment where there is an established infrastructure to cope with emergencies, and if sufficient numbers of trained operator and security staff can be provided. It is unrealistic to assume the near-term availability of SMRs that are so safe they can be shipped around the world without the need to ensure the highest levels of competence and integrity of local regulatory authorities, plant operators, emergency planning organizations and security forces. Fukushima has demonstrated the importance of timely off-site response in the event of a severe accident, so the accessibility of reactors in remote locations also must be a prime consideration. Even within the U.S., small utilities with little or no experience in operating nuclear plants need to fully appreciate the unique challenges and responsibilities associated with nuclear power and should not expect that small modular reactors will provide any relief in this regard.

#### Extinction

Stephen Lendman, The Peoples Voice, 3/12/11, Nuclear Meltdown in Japan, www.thepeoplesvoice.org/TPV3/Voices.php/2011/03/13/nuclear-meltdown-in-japan

Reuters said the 1995 Kobe quake caused $100 billion in damage, up to then the most costly ever natural disaster. This time, from quake and tsunami damage alone, that figure will be dwarfed. Moreover, under a worst case core meltdown, all bets are off as the entire region and beyond will be threatened with permanent contamination, making the most affected areas unsafe to live in. On March 12, Stratfor Global Intelligence issued a "Red Alert: Nuclear Meltdown at Quake-Damaged Japanese Plant," saying: Fukushima Daiichi "nuclear power plant in Okuma, Japan, appears to have caused a reactor meltdown." Stratfor downplayed its seriousness, adding that such an event "does not necessarily mean a nuclear disaster," that already may have happened - the ultimate nightmare short of nuclear winter. According to Stratfor, "(A)s long as the reactor core, which is specifically designed to contain high levels of heat, pressure and radiation, remains intact, the melted fuel can be dealt with. If the (core's) breached but the containment facility built around (it) remains intact, the melted fuel can be....entombed within specialized concrete" as at Chernobyl in 1986. In fact, that disaster killed nearly one million people worldwide from nuclear radiation exposure. In their book titled, "Chernobyl: Consequences of the Catastrophe for People and the Environment," Alexey Yablokov, Vassily Nesterenko and Alexey Nesterenko said: "For the past 23 years, it has been clear that there is a danger greater than nuclear weapons concealed within nuclear power. Emissions from this one reactor exceeded a hundred-fold the radioactive contamination of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki." "No citizen of any country can be assured that he or she can be protected from radioactive contamination. One nuclear reactor can pollute half the globe. Chernobyl fallout covers the entire Northern Hemisphere." Stratfor explained that if Fukushima's floor cracked, "it is highly likely that the melting fuel will burn through (its) containment system and enter the ground. This has never happened before," at least not reported. If now occurring, "containment goes from being merely dangerous, time consuming and expensive to nearly impossible," making the quake, aftershocks, and tsunamis seem mild by comparison. Potentially, millions of lives will be jeopardized. Japanese officials said Fukushima's reactor container wasn't breached. Stratfor and others said it was, making the potential calamity far worse than reported. Japan's Nuclear and Industrial Safety Agency (NISA) said the explosion at Fukushima's Saiichi No. 1 facility could only have been caused by a core meltdown. In fact, 3 or more reactors are affected or at risk. Events are fluid and developing, but remain very serious. The possibility of an extreme catastrophe can't be discounted. Moreover, independent nuclear safety analyst John Large told Al Jazeera that by venting radioactive steam from the inner reactor to the outer dome, a reaction may have occurred, causing the explosion. "When I look at the size of the explosion," he said, "it is my opinion that there could be a very large leak (because) fuel continues to generate heat." Already, Fukushima way exceeds Three Mile Island that experienced a partial core meltdown in Unit 2. Finally it was brought under control, but coverup and denial concealed full details until much later. According to anti-nuclear activist Harvey Wasserman, Japan's quake fallout may cause nuclear disaster, saying: "This is a very serious situation. If the cooling system fails (apparently it has at two or more plants), the super-heated radioactive fuel rods will melt, and (if so) you could conceivably have an explosion," that, in fact, occurred. As a result, massive radiation releases may follow, impacting the entire region. "It could be, literally, an apocalyptic event. The reactor could blow." If so, Russia, China, Korea and most parts of Western Asia will be affected. Many thousands will die, potentially millions under a worse case scenario, including far outside East Asia. Moreover, at least five reactors are at risk. Already, a 20-mile wide radius was evacuated. What happened in Japan can occur anywhere. Yet Obama's proposed budget includes $36 billion for new reactors, a shocking disregard for global safety. Calling Fukushima an "apocalyptic event," Wasserman said "(t)hese nuclear plants have to be shut," let alone budget billions for new ones. It's unthinkable, he said. If a similar disaster struck California, nuclear fallout would affect all America, Canada, Mexico, Central America, and parts of South America. Nuclear Power: A Technology from Hell Nuclear expert Helen Caldicott agrees, telling this writer by phone that a potential regional catastrophe is unfolding. Over 30 years ago, she warned of its inevitability. Her 2006 book titled, "Nuclear Power is Not the Answer" explained that contrary to government and industry propaganda, even during normal operations, nuclear power generation causes significant discharges of greenhouse gas emissions, as well as hundreds of thousands of curies of deadly radioactive gases and other radioactive elements into the environment every year. Moreover, nuclear plants are atom bomb factories. A 1000 megawatt reactor produces 500 pounds of plutonium annually. Only 10 are needed for a bomb able to devastate a large city, besides causing permanent radiation contamination. Nuclear Power not Cleaner and Greener Just the opposite, in fact. Although a nuclear power plant releases no carbon dioxide (CO2), the primary greenhouse gas, a vast infrastructure is required. Called the nuclear fuel cycle, it uses large amounts of fossil fuels. Each cycle stage exacerbates the problem, starting with the enormous cost of mining and milling uranium, needing fossil fuel to do it. How then to dispose of mill tailings, produced in the extraction process. It requires great amounts of greenhouse emitting fuels to remediate. Moreover, other nuclear cycle steps also use fossil fuels, including converting uranium to hexafluoride gas prior to enrichment, the enrichment process itself, and conversion of enriched uranium hexafluoride gas to fuel pellets. In addition, nuclear power plant construction, dismantling and cleanup at the end of their useful life require large amounts of energy. There's more, including contaminated cooling water, nuclear waste, its handling, transportation and disposal/storage, problems so far unresolved. Moreover, nuclear power costs and risks are so enormous that the industry couldn't exist without billions of government subsidized funding annually. The Unaddressed Human Toll from Normal Operations Affected are uranium miners, industry workers, and potentially everyone living close to nuclear reactors that routinely emit harmful radioactive releases daily, harming human health over time, causing illness and early death. The link between radiation exposure and disease is irrefutable, depending only on the amount of cumulative exposure over time, Caldicott saying: "If a regulatory gene is biochemically altered by radiation exposure, the cell will begin to incubate cancer, during a 'latent period of carcinogenesis,' lasting from two to sixty years." In fact, a single gene mutation can prove fatal. No amount of radiation exposure is safe. Moreover, when combined with about 80,000 commonly used toxic chemicals and contaminated GMO foods and ingredients, it causes 80% of known cancers, putting everyone at risk everywhere. Further, the combined effects of allowable radiation exposure, uranium mining, milling operations, enrichment, and fuel fabrication can be devastating to those exposed. Besides the insoluble waste storage/disposal problem, nuclear accidents happen and catastrophic ones are inevitable. Inevitable Meltdowns Caldicott and other experts agree they're certain in one or more of the hundreds of reactors operating globally, many years after their scheduled shutdown dates unsafely. Combined with human error, imprudently minimizing operating costs, internal sabotage, or the effects of a high-magnitude quake and/or tsunami, an eventual catastrophe is certain. Aging plants alone, like Japan's Fukushima facility, pose unacceptable risks based on their record of near-misses and meltdowns, resulting from human error, old equipment, shoddy maintenance, and poor regulatory oversight. However, under optimum operating conditions, all nuclear plants are unsafe. Like any machine or facility, they're vulnerable to breakdowns, that if serious enough can cause enormous, possibly catastrophic, harm. Add nuclear war to the mix, also potentially inevitable according to some experts, by accident or intent, including Steven Starr saying: "Only a single failure of nuclear deterrence is required to start a nuclear war," the consequences of which "would be profound, potentially killing "tens of millions of people, and caus(ing) long-term, catastrophic disruptions of the global climate and massive destruction of Earth's protective ozone layer. The result would be a global nuclear famine that could kill up to one billion people." Worse still is nuclear winter, the ultimate nightmare, able to end all life if it happens. It's nuclear proliferation's unacceptable risk, a clear and present danger as long as nuclear weapons and commercial dependency exist.

#### Status quo solves and nuclear desalination is ineffective

Gar Smith 11, Editor Emeritus of Earth Island Journal, a former editor of Common Ground magazine, a Project Censored Award-winning journalist, and co-founder of Environmentalists Against War, "NUCLEAR ROULETTE: THE CASE AGAINST A NUCLEAR RENAISSANCE," June, International Forum on Globalization series focused on False Solutions, http://ifg.org/pdf/Nuclear\_Roulette\_book.pdf

By 2025, 3.5 billion people will face severe fresh-water shortages. Nuclear proponents groping for justifications to expand nuclear power have argued that the waste heat from power plants can provide a “cheap and clean” solution to the inherently costly process of removing salt from seawater. Desalination plants (there are 13,080 worldwide, mostly oil- and gas-fired and mostly in wealthy desert nations) already produce more than 12 billion gallons of drinkable water a day. 153 The first nuclear desalinator was installed in Japan in the late 1970s and scores of reactor-heated desalination plants are operating around the world today.¶ But nuclear desalination is another False Solution. The problem with atomic water-purifiers is that using heat to treat seawater is an obsolete 20 th -century technology. Thermal desalination has given way to new reverse osmosis systems that are less energy intensive and 33 times cheaper to operate. 154 Nuclear desalination advocates claim that wind, solar, and wave power aren’t up to the task while new low-temperature evaporation technology may be able to produce high purity water at temperatures as low as 122° Fahrenheit. 155 Promoting reactors as a solution to the world’s water shortage is especially ludicrous since nuclear power plants consume more water than any other energy source. 156¶ Even proponents admit there is a potential risk that running seawater through a radioactive environment might contaminate the drinking water produced. 157 Undeterred, scientists in Russia and India have proposed anchoring small atom-powered water-plants offshore near densely populated coastal cities. But this would provide no relief for the billions of people living inland in water-starved regions of North Africa and Asia.¶ Desalination is merely a way of giving a marginal new purpose to existing reactors whose balance sheets would be improved if they were retrofitted with desalination chambers. As with power generation, so with desalination: efficiency in water use (better irrigation technology, crop selection, eliminating transit losses, etc.) beats new production.¶ A real solution to the growing global water shortage needs to address the increasing amount of water diverted to wasteful agricultural and industrial practices and concentrate on preventing the water from being contaminated in the first place—by, among other things, capping the size of local populations to match locally available water supplies.

#### No water wars

Allouche 11

Jeremy Allouche 11 is currently a Research Fellow at the Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex. "The sustainability and resilience of global water and food systems: Political analysis of the interplay between security, resource scarcity, political systems and global trade" Food PolicyVolume 36, Supplement 1, January 2011, Pages S3-S8 Accessed via: Science Direct Sciverse¶ Water/food resources, war and conflict

The question of resource scarcity has led to many debates on whether scarcity (whether of food or water) will lead to conflict and war. The underlining reasoning behind most of these discourses over food and water wars comes from the Malthusian belief that there is an imbalance between the economic availability of natural resources and population growth since while food production grows linearly, population increases exponentially. Following this reasoning, neo-Malthusians claim that finite natural resources place a strict limit on the growth of human population and aggregate consumption; if these limits are exceeded, social breakdown, conflict and wars result. Nonetheless, it seems that most empirical studies do not support any of these neo-Malthusian arguments. Technological change **and greater inputs of capital** have **dramatically increased labour productivity in agriculture.** More generally, the neo-Malthusian view has suffered because during the last two centuries **humankind has breached many resource barriers that seemed unchallengeable**. Lessons from history: alarmist scenarios, resource wars and international relations In a so-called age of uncertainty, a number of alarmist scenarios have linked the increasing use of water resources and food insecurity with wars. The idea of water wars (perhaps more than food wars) is a dominant discourse in the media (see for example Smith, 2009), NGOs (International Alert, 2007) and within international organizations (UNEP, 2007). In 2007, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon declared that ‘water scarcity threatens economic and social gains and is a potent fuel for wars and conflict’ (Lewis, 2007). Of course, this type of discourse has an **instrumental purpose**; security and conflict are here used for raising water/food as key policy priorities at the international level.¶ In the Middle East, presidents, prime ministers and foreign ministers have also used this bellicose rhetoric. Boutrous Boutros-Gali said; ‘the next war in the Middle East will be over water, not politics’ (Boutros Boutros-Gali in Butts, 1997, p. 65). The question is not whether the sharing of transboundary water sparks political tension and alarmist declaration, but rather to what extent water has been a principal factor in international conflicts. The evidence seems quite weak. Whether by president Sadat in Egypt or King Hussein in Jordan, none **of these declarations have been followed up by military action**.¶ The governance of transboundary water has gained increased attention these last decades. This has a direct impact on the global food system as water allocation agreements determine the amount of water that can used for irrigated agriculture. The likelihood of conflicts over water is an important parameter to consider in assessing the stability, sustainability and resilience of global food systems.¶ None **of the** various and extensive databases on the causes of war show water as a casus belli. Using the International Crisis Behavior (ICB) data set and supplementary data from the University of Alabama on water conflicts, Hewitt, Wolf and Hammer found only seven disputes where water seems to have been at least a partial cause for conflict (Wolf, 1998, p. 251). In fact, about 80% of the incidents relating to water were limited purely to governmental rhetoric intended for the electorate (Otchet, 2001, p. 18).¶ As shown in The Basins At Risk (BAR) water event database, **more than two-thirds of over 1800 water-related ‘events’ fall on the ‘cooperative’ scale** (Yoffe et al., 2003). Indeed, if one takes into account a much longer period, the following figures clearly demonstrate this argument. According to studies by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), organized political bodies signed between the year 805 and 1984 more than 3600 water-related treaties, and approximately 300 treaties dealing with water management or allocations in international basins have been negotiated since 1945 ([FAO, 1978] and [FAO, 1984]).¶ The fear around water wars have been driven by a Malthusian outlook which equates scarcity with violence, conflict and war. There is however **no direct correlation between water scarcity and transboundary conflict**. Most specialists now tend to agree that the major issue is not scarcity per se but rather the allocation of water resources between the different riparian states (see for example [Allouche, 2005], [Allouche, 2007] and [Rouyer, 2000]). Water rich countries have been involved in a number of disputes with other relatively water rich countries (see for example India/Pakistan or Brazil/Argentina). The perception of each state’s estimated water needs really constitutes the core issue in transboundary water relations. Indeed, whether this scarcity exists or not in reality, perceptions of the amount of available water shapes people’s attitude towards the environment (Ohlsson, 1999). In fact, some water experts have argued that scarcity drives the process of co-operation among riparians ([Dinar and Dinar, 2005] and [Brochmann and Gleditsch, 2006]).¶ In terms of international relations, the threat of water wars due to increasing scarcity **does not make much sense in the light of the recent** historical record. Overall, the water war rationale expects conflict to occur over water, and appears to suggest that violence is a viable means of securing national water supplies, an argument which is highly contestable.¶ The debates over the likely impacts of climate change have again popularised the idea of water wars. The argument runs that climate change will precipitate worsening ecological conditions contributing to resource scarcities, social breakdown, institutional failure, mass migrations and in turn cause greater political instability and conflict ([Brauch, 2002] and [Pervis and Busby, 2004]). In a report for the US Department of Defense, Schwartz and Randall (2003) speculate about the consequences of a worst-case climate change scenario arguing that water shortages will lead to aggressive wars (Schwartz and Randall, 2003, p. 15). Despite growing concern that climate change will lead to instability and violent conflict, **the evidence base to substantiate the connections is thin** ([Barnett and Adger, 2007] and [Kevane and Gray, 2008]).

#### Food shortages inevitable

Dawson ‘6

Thomas, January 5. American Chronicle, “Food for Thought and the Price of Food,” <http://www.americanchronicle.com/articles/viewArticle.asp?articleID=4533>

It may seem to many that we are living in a period in which there are potentially insurmountable problems facing us on every side. Certainly the world is on the precipice of a population explosion that we will be unable to sustain. The consumption of our natural resources and the destruction of our environment continue on a scale never imagined by the majority of us. However, nearly every generation of mankind has seen periods of hard times and some of us have experienced some very good times as well. The very nature of life on earth has been a history of turmoil and upheaval, from subsistence and mere survival to prosperity and a degree of security, and sometimes, back again. Don’t expect things to change for the better in the very near future regardless of our sophisticated economy. Consider the single aspect of food prices in the western world. Food has been relatively inexpensive in the western world, except in war-torn areas for the entire lifetime of our generation. This will probably not be the case for the next generation. It was only a few years ago that the population explosion was in the news all the time, almost to the same extent that we are currently preoccupied with the energy crunch usually referred to as “peak oil”, and the erosion of the western standard of living by “globalization”. The media let up on the problems of population growth because people got tired of hearing about it. After all, the western world didn’t appear to be particularly affected by it. The population explosion has since been generally ignored in the news until recently. That is not to infer that the problem went away. It took thousands of years of human history to produce and sustain a population of a billion people by the early nineteenth century. In the past 200 years, we have multiplied that population by six. There are now over six billion people in the world and we will add the next billion people in only about a dozen years. With the advent of the industrial revolution, the western world became trade oriented over the last couple of centuries. Since the cold war has ended, our international companies have seized opportunities to sharply increase their profits by arbitraging the labor markets of Asia while selling products at home; sometimes referred to as globalization. This employment of large numbers of people has given impetus and acceleration to the already rising prosperity of a small percentage of the population in various parts of Asia. This small increase in prosperity affecting such large numbers of people has spawned a demand for resources and commodities around the world. Suddenly, a few people in the more populated parts of the world have the monetary wherewithal to improve their standard of living and have hopes for a better life for their children. They have needs of infrastructure, electricity and transportation as well as food. Now the western world finds itself competing for limited resources, especially energy. The most efficient forms of energy are oil and gas. The owners of oil and gas find themselves in an enviable position where they have an asset worthy of preservation. They will probably never again allow the prices to fall very much for any extended period of time. The cost of energy and fertilizer (usually made from natural gas) are substantial costs in food production, not to mention the cost of transporting that food. The 2006 crops will be affected by the recent increase of prices in oil and gas. Expect food prices to accelerate their rise in the next year and continue to rise thereafter. To exacerbate the problem, many farmers around the world can now make more money raising crops for bio-diesel fuels than they can make raising food. Across South Asia, in the Amazon and elsewhere, farmers are razing the forests to plant crops capable of making biofuels. Even in this country, laws will be enacted to require some percentage of ethanol or the addition of some kind of bio-fuels to gasoline and diesel fuels to further subsidize and satisfy the farm lobby.

### WARMING

**Takes years after development to export SMR’s**

Kessides & Kuznetov 8-14

Ioannis is with the Development Group at the World Bank and Vladimir is a Consultant with the World Bank, “Small Modular Reactors for Enhancing Energy Security in Developing Countries,” <http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/4/8/1806/htm>

The generally acknowledged challenge for SMRs is to provide levelized unit electricity cost that is competitive with comparable base-load electricity generation sources in a user country. However, aside from this important economic challenge, SMRs may face other deployment challenges in developing countries. These potential issues include:¶ • Proven technology requirements by developing countries suggest that several units of the plant should have a proven operating experience of 3-5 years. All current SMRs designs are expected to be deployed first in their countries of origin or in another developed technology holder country. Such plants would need to operate for several years before they are offered for export to developing countries.

#### Can’t solve emissions- lack of plants globally and not fast enough

Netzer ‘11

[Nina Netzer and Jochen Steinhilber. The authors work for the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung in Berlin, Germany. Jochen Steinhilber is Head of the Department for Global Policy and Develop­ment, Nina Netzer is in charge of International Energy and Climate Policy. “The end of nuclear energy? International perspectives after Fukushima.” July 2011 ETB]

In weighing out different aims and scenarios, it is considering that neither fossil fuels nor nuclear energy have ever been a low-emission or ecologically sustainable choice. While it is indeed true that a nuclear power plant does not produce any CO2 in operation, if one takes into account the entire cycle of construction and operation all the way to decommissioning and in particular includes the mining of uranium and manufacture of fuel rods in the equation, greenhouse gases certainly are produced, as fossil energy fuels are used for many of these processes. On top of this, the potential for reduc­tion of CO2 emissions in this sector is not particularly high because of the low percentage of nuclear energy in global primary energy production. It will moreover scarcely be possible to build enough reactors in the near future in order to reduce the global emissions balance. To reach the target accepted by the international com­munity of states at the World Climate Summit in Cancun of keeping global warming to below 2°, global green­house emissions would have to decline by at least 50 per cent by 2050. Because the average time required to put a reactor into operation from the planning to commis­sioning is approximately 10 years, nuclear energy can­not provide any speedier contribution to a reduction of emissions.

#### Displacing coal will take decades

Maloney ‘12

[Stephen, Managing Consultant, Towers Perrin Risk and Financial Service Practice. “The Future of Nuclear Power in the US.” Federation of American Scientists, February 2012. ETB]

Some advocates suggest a significant investment in nuclear power plant capacity can make an efficient and meaningful contribution to greenhouse gas reduction. As reported by the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA), greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are expected to grow about 0.3 percent annually through 2035, down from 0.8 percent annually (1980-2008). At this rate, pre-recession emissions will not be reached until 2025. In addition to setting back the need for additional electricity generation, the recession also set back GHG imperatives. In 2008, power generation represented 41 percent of the emissions. Coal’s 48 percent market share accounts for 82 percent of power sector CO2 emissions. However, coal-fired generation is currently being displaced by natural gas capacity, which would emit roughly half the amount of GHG emissions. While substantial nuclear construction might further cut into the coal plants’ emissions, it won’t begin to displace coal for some years to decades to come.

#### Flood of new reactors overstretches NRC funds and personnel- causes accidents and prevents solvency

Weaver 7 Lynn, President Emirtus of Florida Institute of Technology, “Fund NRC Nuclear Power Licensing” <http://www.theledger.com/article/20070207/COLUMNISTS03/702070394?p=3&tc=pg>

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has alerted several utilities that license reviews would be delayed at least a year.¶ With all the concern in Congress over global warming, one might think that an increase in the number of nuclear power plants in the United States is inevitable, both to satisfy energy demands and to counter greenhouse-gas emissions. But that, of course, would be wrong.¶ There are about 100 nuclear plants in the United States and they account for about 75 percent of our country's emission-free electricity.¶ Utilities are preparing to build another 33 plants, including two in Florida.¶ These would be the first reactors to be built in this country in many years, and federal and state energy officials agree that it won't be possible to reduce U.S. greenhouse emissions without them. But it now appears that electric utilities might not be able to obtain licenses anytime soon to build new nuclear plants.¶ The reason for the licensing delay is simple-and-straightforward: a critical shortage of manpower at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission - which is expected to become acute within a year. The NRC knows that it needs to expand its workforce, because it's facing a flood of regulatory reviews for new nuclear plants and existing plants that are seeking a renewal of their operating licenses. But it doesn't have the money.¶ Congress is bogged down in a dispute over federal spending. It has passed just two of the 11 spending bills for the fiscal year that began last October, those covering defense and homeland security. The rest of the government is operating under a continuing resolution that holds spending to last year's levels.¶ As a result, the NRC's budget is lower by $95 million (12 percent), compared with the level approved by both the House and Senate appropriations committees, but not the full House.¶ This has meant that the NRC doesn't have enough funds to handle the resurgence in nuclear power. In fact, it recently alerted several utilities that reviews of their applications for license renewal would be delayed at least a year, because it does not have the capability to deal with more than a few applications at a time.¶ So far, the NRC has done a commendable job of coping with the situation, even though its budget in recent years has been slighted. Since 2000, the licenses of 48 nuclear plants - including all of the units at the Turkey Point plant and the St. Lucie plant in Florida - have been extended for another 20 years, but the owners of many other plants now face some uncertainty in getting the license of their plants renewed. And the start of construction of new nuclear plants could be set back.

#### No impact - threat overestimated and global warming is solved by adaptation and mitigation.

Mendelsohn 9

(Robert O. the Edwin Weyerhaeuser Davis Professor, Yale School of¶ Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, June 2009, “Climate Change and¶ Economic Growth,” online: http://www.growthcommission.org/storage/cgdev/documents/¶ gcwp060web.pdf

The heart of the debate about climate change comes from a number of warnings from scientists and others that give the impression that human induced climate change is an immediate threat to society (IPCC 2007a,b; Stern 2006.) Millions of people might be vulnerable to health effects (IPCC 2007b) crop production might fall in the low latitudes (IPCC 2007b), water supplies might dwindle (IPCC 2007b), precipitation might fall in arid regions (IPCC 2007b), extreme events will grow exponentially (Stern 2006), and between 20-30 percent of species will risk extinction (IPCC 2007b). Even worse, there may be catastrophic events such as the melting of Greenland or Antarctic ice sheets causing severe sea level rise, which would inundate hundreds of millions of people. (Dasgupta et al. 2009) Proponents argue there is no time to waste. Unless greenhouse gases are cut dramatically today, economic growth and wellbeing may be at risk (Stern 2006). These statements are largely alarmist and misleading. Although climate change is a serious problem that deserves attention, society’s immediate behavior has an extremely low probability of leading to catastrophic consequences. The science and economics of climate change is quite clear that emissions over the next few decades will lead to only mild consequences. The severe impacts predicted by alarmists require a century (or two in the Case of Stern 2006) of no mitigation. Many of the predicted impacts assume there will be no or little adaptation. the net economic impacts from climate change over the next 50 years will take more than a century or even a millennium to unfold and many of these “potential” impacts will never occur because people will adapt. It is not at all apparent that immediate and dramatic policies need to be developed to thwart long‐range climate risks. What is needed are long-run balanced responses.

#### 6 degree warming’s inevitable

AP 9

(Associated Press, Six Degree Temperature Rise by 2100 is Inevitable: UNEP, September 24, <http://www.speedy-fit.co.uk/index2.php?option=com_content&do_pdf=1&id=168>)

Earth's temperature is likely to jump six degrees between now and the end of the century even if every country cuts greenhouse gas emissions as proposed, according to a United Nations update. Scientists looked at emission plans from 192 nations and calculated what would happen to global warming. The projections take into account 80 percent emission cuts from the U.S. and Europe by 2050, which are not sure things. The U.S. figure is based on a bill that passed the House of Representatives but is running into resistance in the Senate, where debate has been delayed by health care reform efforts. Carbon dioxide, mostly from the burning of fossil fuels such as coal and oil, is the main cause of global warming, trapping the sun's energy in the atmosphere. The world's average temperature has already risen 1.4 degrees since the 19th century. Much of projected rise in temperature is because of developing nations, which aren't talking much about cutting their emissions, scientists said at a United Nations press conference Thursday. China alone adds nearly 2 degrees to the projections. "We are headed toward very serious changes in our planet," said Achim Steiner, head of the U.N.'s environment program, which issued the update on Thursday. The review looked at some 400 peer-reviewed papers on climate over the last three years. Even if the developed world cuts its emissions by 80 percent and the developing world cuts theirs in half by 2050, as some experts propose, the world is still facing a 3-degree increase by the end of the century, said Robert Corell, a prominent U.S. climate scientist who helped oversee the update. Corell said the most likely agreement out of the international climate negotiations in Copenhagen in December still translates into a nearly 5-degree increase in world temperature by the end of the century. European leaders and the Obama White House have set a goal to limit warming to just a couple degrees. The U.N.'s environment program unveiled the update on peer-reviewed climate change science to tell diplomats how hot the planet is getting. The last big report from the Nobel Prize-winning Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change came out more than two years ago and is based on science that is at least three to four years old, Steiner said. Global warming is speeding up, especially in the Arctic, and that means that some top-level science projections from 2007 are already out of date and overly optimistic. Corell, who headed an assessment of warming in the Arctic, said global warming "is accelerating in ways that we are not anticipating." Because Greenland and West Antarctic ice sheets are melting far faster than thought, it looks like the seas will rise twice as fast as projected just three years ago, Corell said. He said seas should rise about a foot every 20 to 25 years.

#### CO2 isn’t key

Watts 12

Watts, 25-year climate reporter, works with weather technology, weather stations, and weather data processing systems in the private sector, 7/25/’12

(Anthony, <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/07/25/lindzen-at-sandia-national-labs-climate-models-are-flawed/>)

ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. — Massachusetts Institute of Technology professor Richard Lindzen, a global warming skeptic, told about 70 Sandia researchers in June that too much is being made of climate change by researchers seeking government funding. He said their data and their methods did not support their claims.¶ “Despite concerns over the last decades with the greenhouse process, they oversimplify the effect,” he said. “Simply cranking up CO2 [carbon dioxide] (as the culprit) is not the answer” to what causes climate change.¶ Lindzen, the ninth speaker in Sandia’s Climate Change and National Security Speaker Series, is Alfred P. Sloan professor of meteorology in MIT’s department of earth, atmospheric and planetary sciences. He has published more than 200 scientific papers and is the lead author of Chapter 7 (“Physical Climate Processes and Feedbacks”) of the International Panel on Climate Change’s (IPCC) Third Assessment Report. He is a member of the National Academy of Sciences and a fellow of the American Geophysical Union and the American Meteorological Society.¶ For 30 years, climate scientists have been “locked into a simple-minded identification of climate with greenhouse-gas level. … That climate should be the function of a single parameter (like CO2) has always seemed implausible. Yet an obsessive focus on such an obvious oversimplification has likely set back progress by decades,” Lindzen said.¶ For major climates of the past, other factors were more important than carbon dioxide. Orbital variations have been shown to quantitatively account for the cycles of glaciations of the past 700,000 years, he said, and the elimination of the arctic inversion, when the polar caps were ice-free, “is likely to have been more important than CO2 for the warm episode during the Eocene 50 million years ago.”¶ There is little evidence that changes in climate are producing extreme weather events, he said. “Even the IPCC says there is little if any evidence of this. In fact, there are important physical reasons for doubting such anticipations.”¶ Lindzen’s views run counter to those of almost all major professional societies. For example, the American Physical Society statement of Nov. 18, 2007, read, “The evidence is incontrovertible: Global warming is occurring.” But he doesn’t feel they are necessarily right. “Why did the American Physical Society take a position?” he asked his audience. “Why did they find it compelling? They never answered.”¶ Speaking methodically with flashes of humor — “I always feel that when the conversation turns to weather, people are bored.” — he said a basic problem with current computer climate models that show disastrous increases in temperature is that relatively small increases in atmospheric gases lead to large changes in temperatures in the models.¶ But, he said, “predictions based on high (climate) sensitivity ran well ahead of observations.”¶ Real-world observations do not support IPCC models, he said: “We’ve already seen almost the equivalent of a doubling of CO2 (in radiative forcing) and that has produced very little warming.”¶He disparaged proving the worth of models by applying their criteria to the prediction of past climatic events, saying, “The models are no more valuable than answering a test when you have the questions in advance.”¶ Modelers, he said, merely have used aerosols as a kind of fudge factor to make their models come out right. (Aerosols are tiny particles that reflect sunlight. They are put in the air by industrial or volcanic processes and are considered a possible cause of temperature change at Earth’s surface.)¶ Then there is the practical question of what can be done about temperature increases even if they are occurring, he said. “China, India, Korea are not going to go along with IPCC recommendations, so … the only countries punished will be those who go along with the recommendations.”¶ He discounted mainstream opinion that climate change could hurt national security, saying that “historically there is little evidence of natural disasters leading to war, but economic conditions have proven much more serious. Almost all proposed mitigation policies lead to reduced energy availability and higher energy costs. All studies of human benefit and national security perspectives show that increased energy is important.”¶ He showed a graph that demonstrated that more energy consumption leads to higher literacy rate, lower infant mortality and a lower number of children per woman.¶ Given that proposed policies are unlikely to significantly influence climate and that lower energy availability could be considered a significant threat to national security, to continue with a mitigation policy that reduces available energy “would, at the least, appear to be irresponsible,” he argued.¶ Responding to audience questions about rising temperatures, he said a 0.8 of a degree C change in temperature in 150 years is a small change. Questioned about five-, seven-, and 17-year averages that seem to show that Earth’s surface temperature is rising, he said temperatures are always fluctuating by tenths of a degree.

### SOLVENCY

#### SMRs not commercialized- natural gas

Scientific America 3/27

(David Biello, “Small Reactors Make a Bid to Revive Nuclear Power¶ Can small, LEGO-like reactors help create better prospects for the nuclear industry?” <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=small-reactors-bid-to-revive-nuclear-power&print=true>, SEH)

Regardless of how cheap such small modular reactors may allow nuclear to be in future, it is unlikely to be as cheap as natural-gas-fired turbines in the present. In fact, low natural gas prices stalled the U.S. nuclear renaissance outside Georgia and South Carolina, long before the reactor meltdowns at Fukushima Daiichi in Japan. "Because of an unanticipated abundance of natural gas in the United States, nuclear energy, in general, is facing tough competition," noted an analysis of the prospects for small modular reactors from the University of Chicago published last November. The analysis also suggested that small reactors would be more expensive than large reactors on a per-megawatt basis until manufacturing in significant quantities has happened. "It [is] unlikely that SMRs will be commercialized without some form of government incentive."

#### Decade before solvency

St. Louis Post-Dispatch ‘12

[Jeffrey Tomich, <http://www.dispatch.com/content/stories/business/2012/05/10/small-problem.html> ETB]

For all the hype, small reactors are still at least a decade away. And that’s if design, licensing and commercial development go at the pace hoped for by the nuclear industry.¶ And even then, the potential for small reactors hinges on how they compete in the energy marketplace. More than concerns about nuclear safety in the wake of the Fukushima disaster in Japan or the problem of where to dispose of highly radioactive spent nuclear fuel, the technology’s future will be dictated by economics.¶ Jackson said Westinghouse aspires to make small reactors whose costs are equal to or less than full-size reactors.¶ For now, there’s no cost data for small reactors and no firm evidence they will produce electricity at a lower price than larger plants.¶ “It’s too early to determine that,” Klein said. “We’re going to have to see some built.”

## 2NC

### Tritium

#### Evidence says economic interdependence checks – that’s disproven on the politics flow

#### Seriously, there will be wars: economics, security dilemma, nationalism

Mearsheimer 99

Mearsheimer, Distinguished Professor of Political Science, 1999. ¶ (John Mearsheimer, “Is Major War Obsolete?” 1999, http://www.ciaonet.org/conf/cfr10/index.html

So what I’m saying here is you can have an absence of war, but it can be for two different sets of reasons; one the obsolescence rationale that Michael laid out, and two the deterrence rationale. Now I think the central claim that’s on the table is wrong-headed, and let me tell you why. First of all, there are a number of good reasons why great powers in the system will think seriously about going to war in the future, and I’ll give you three of them and try and illustrate some cases. First, states oftentimes compete for economic resources. Is it hard to imagine a situation where a reconstituted Russia gets into a war with the United States and the Persian Gulf over Gulf oil? I don’t think that’s implausible. Is it hard to imagine Japan and China getting into a war in the South China Sea over economic resources? I don’t find that hard to imagine. A second reason that states go to war which, of course, is dear to the heart of realists like me, and that’s to enhance their security. Take the United States out of Europe, put the Germans on their own; you got the Germans on one side and the Russians on the other, and in between a huge buffer zone called eastern or central Europe. Call it what you want. Is it impossible to imagine the Russians and the Germans getting into a fight over control of that vacuum? Highly likely, no, but feasible, for sure. Is it hard to imagine Japan and China getting into a war over the South China Sea, not for resource reasons but because Japanese sea-lines of communication run through there and a huge Chinese navy may threaten it? I don’t think it’s impossible to imagine that. What about nationalism, a third reason? China, fighting in the United States over Taiwan? You think that’s impossible? I don’t think that’s impossible. That’s a scenario that makes me very nervous. I can figure out all sorts of ways, none of which are highly likely, that the Chinese and the Americans end up shooting at each other. It doesn’t necessarily have to be World War III, but it is great-power war. Chinese and Russians fighting each other over Siberia? As many of you know, there are huge numbers of Chinese going into Siberia. You start mixing ethnic populations in most areas of the world outside the United States and it’s usually a prescription for big trouble. Again, not highly likely, but possible. I could go on and on, positing a lot of scenarios where great powers have good reasons to go to war against other great powers.

#### Turns water adv

Kim 11

[S.O., Fusion Science and Technology, V60, n3, October, <http://www.new.ans.org/store/j_12575>, mg]

The high mobility of tritium as HTO implies that, under steady-state conditions, the T/H ratio (or equivalently the HTO concentration) is the same in all water compartments of the environment. This is the basis of the specific activity (SA) model, which underlies almost all environmental tritium models. SA concepts apply to organically bound tritium (OBT) as well, since the OBT formed by a given plant process at a given time has a T/H ratio that reflects the ratio in the water that enters into that process. There is no empirical evidence that the bioaccumulation of tritium in aquatic and wetland plants will occur. OBT/HTO ratios less than one is consistently found in the laboratory where the HTO concentrations to which the plants are exposed can be held constant. These data suggest a value of 0.7 for the OBT/HTO ratio under equilibrium conditions in the laboratory. Theoretical considerations suggest that the value of the OBT/HTO ratio in plants is significantly different from one and, in most cases, greater than one. This is primarily due to the much longer residence time of OBT in plants as compared to HTO. The observed HTO concentrations are much higher than OBT concentrations, which makes OBT/HTO ratio smaller than unit in contrast with SA based expectations. In addition to this, the IMPACT model overpredicted HTO and OBT concentrations in plants and animals by a factor of 3 or 4, on average. This work is summary of the AECL funded research project (1).

### Cliff

### 2NC Overview (Econ)

#### Regional nuclear war will cause nuclear winter and ozone depletion

[UCLA International Institute](http://www.international.ucla.edu) ‘6

([UCLA News](http://www.newsroom.ucla.edu/page.asp?relnum=7553) releas, “Nuclear War Can't Be 'Regional,'” 12-11, UCLA International Institute, <http://www.isop.ucla.edu/article.asp?parentid=59428>)

Even a small-scale, regional nuclear war could produce as many direct fatalities as occurred during all of World War II and disrupt the global climate for a decade or more, impacting nearly everyone on Earth. These conclusions are reported by a team of scientists from UCLA, the University of Colorado at Boulder and Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey in two research articles posted online in the journal Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions and at a press conference today at the American Geophysical Union's annual meeting in San Francisco. The new results represent the first comprehensive quantitative assessment of the consequences of a nuclear conflict between small or emerging nuclear states, said Richard Turco, professor in the UCLA Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences and a member and founding director of UCLA's Institute of the Environment. The team of scientists reviewed the current status of nuclear weapons development, analyzed data on modern megacities and applied a state-of-the-science climate model. They calculated the local effects of individual "small," Hiroshima-size (15-kiloton) nuclear detonations in urban centers, including potential casualties from the blast and radioactive fallout, Turco said. Even the smallest nuclear powers today and in the near future may have as many as 50 or more Hiroshima-size weapons in their arsenals, according to the scientists. Moreover, about 40 countries possess enough plutonium and uranium to construct substantial nuclear arsenals. "Considering the relatively small number and sizes of the weapons — perhaps less than one megaton in total yield — the potential devastation would be catastrophic and long-term," Toon said. "A single low-yield nuclear detonation in an urban center could lead to more fatalities, in some cases by orders of magnitude, than occurred in major historical wars." Megacities attacked with nuclear devices, through war or terrorism, would likely be abandoned indefinitely, inducing mass migration and long-term economic decline, Turco said.  Turco in the 1980s headed a group — whose members included Owen "Brian" Toon, a co-author on the current research, and the late Carl Sagan — that originally defined the "nuclear winter" phenomenon, a phrase that Turco coined. For a regional-scale nuclear conflict, fatality estimates range from 2.6 million to 16.7 million, Turco said. The scientists estimated the quantities of soot — the highly absorbing component of smoke — that would be generated in urban firestorms ignited by nuclear detonations. This effort was led by Toon, professor and chair of the department of atmospheric and oceanic sciences at the University of Colorado at Boulder, together with Turco and University of Colorado student Charles Bardeen. At Rutgers, Alan Robock, professor of environmental sciences and associate director of the Center for Environmental Prediction at Rutgers' Cook College, professor Georgiy Stenchikov and postdoctoral associate Luke Oman (now at Johns Hopkins University) employed a coupled atmosphere-ocean climate model to simulate the effects of the putative smoke emissions in perturbing the global climate system and causing regional climatic anomalies. The amount of soot emitted by firestorms was found to exceed 5 million metric tons in many cases. Because so many people live in megacities, the quantity of black smoke generated per kiloton of explosive yield could be more than 100 times larger than previously estimated for a full-scale superpower nuclear exchange involving thousands of megatons, according to one of the journal papers. While a regional nuclear confrontation among emerging nuclear powers might be geographically constrained, the environmental impacts could spread worldwide, Robock and his colleagues conclude. "We examined the climatic effects of the smoke produced in a regional conflict in the subtropics between two opposing nations, each using 50 Hiroshima-size nuclear weapons to attack the other's most populated urban areas," Robock said. The post-war climate simulations used soot emissions provided by Toon, Turco and Bardeen. As had been suggested in earlier nuclear winter studies, and more recently by observations of large wildfire smoke plumes, Robock's calculations indicate that a large fraction of the nuclear soot could linger in the upper atmosphere for up to a decade, producing significant cooling and reduced precipitation, with the greatest changes occurring over land. The implications for global food supplies appear grim. "A cooling of several degrees would occur over large areas of North America and Eurasia, including most of the grain-growing regions," Robock said. "As was the case with earlier nuclear winter calculations, large climatic effects would occur in regions far removed from the target areas or the countries involved in the conflict." When Robock and his team calibrated their climate model against the recorded response to the 1912 eruptions of Katmai volcano in Alaska, they found that observed temperature anomalies were accurately reproduced. On a grander scale, the 1815 eruption of Tambora in Indonesia, the largest in the last 500 years, was followed by killing frosts throughout New England in 1816 during what has become known as "the year without a summer." The weather in Europe was reported to be so cold and wet that the harvest failed and starvation stalked most of the continent. This historical event, according to Robock, perhaps foreshadows the kind of climate disruptions that would follow a regional nuclear conflict. The researchers emphasized that known climatic anomalies associated with major volcanic eruptions such as Tambora typically last for a year or so because volcanic particles tend to fall out of the atmosphere relatively quickly. By contrast, nuclear-generated soot particles may remain suspended in the upper troposphere and stratosphere for up to a decade as a result of the strong interactions between solar heat absorption by the smoke and wind patterns in the upper atmosphere. Consequently, the climatic effects can be significantly greater and longer lasting than those associated with any historical volcanic eruption. "With the exchange of 100 15-kiloton weapons as posed in our baseline scenario, the estimated quantities of smoke could lead to global climate anomalies exceeding any experienced in recorded history," Robock said. "And that's just 0.03 percent of the total explosive power of the current world nuclear arsenal." In related research, researcher Michael Mills of the University of Colorado at Boulder led a broad team, including Toon and Turco, in defining the impacts of a regional nuclear conflict on the stratospheric ozone layer. Mills' results, based on detailed simulations with a two-dimensional global chemical-transport model, reveal average column ozone losses exceeding 20 percent worldwide and persisting for at least three to four years, with mid-latitude losses as large as 30 to 40 percent and polar reductions up to 70 percent. Such ozone depletions would be unprecedented in human history and imply serious ecological and human consequences, Turco said. The primary effects on ozone are due to accelerated catalytic chemical cycles, which are caused by the heating of the stratosphere as injected soot absorbs sunlight, and to severely perturbed dynamics of the region, again owing to the soot heating. Previous studies, carried out in the 1980s with less sophisticated models, had indicated comparable or smaller ozone losses for a full superpower nuclear exchange, Mills noted. Turco said that a small nuclear state is likely to direct its weapons against population centers to maximize damage and achieve the greatest advantage, thus making such outcomes more plausible. The research team concludes that the confluence of nuclear proliferation, political instability and urban demographics forms perhaps the greatest danger to the stability of human society since the dawn of civilization.

### 2NC UQ

#### There will be a deal in the lame duck, but PC is key

Kimberly Atkins 11-8, Boston Herald columnist, “Prez returns to D.C. with more clout,” 11/8/12, http://bostonherald.com/news/columnists/view/20221108prez\_returns\_to\_dc\_with\_more\_clout

When President Obama returned yesterday to the White House, he brought with him political capital earned in a tough re-election fight as well as a mandate from voters — which means bold changes and bruising fights could lie ahead. ¶ The first agenda item is already waiting for him: reaching an agreement with lawmakers to avert the looming fiscal cliff. GOP lawmakers have previously shot down any plan involving tax increases. Obama’s win — based in part on a message of making the wealthiest Americans pay more — may already be paying dividends.¶ In remarks at the Capitol yesterday, House Speaker John Boehner seemed to acknowledge the GOP has to take a different tack than the obstructionism that has marred progress in the past.¶ “The president has signaled a willingness to do tax reform with lower rates. Republicans have signaled a willingness to accept new revenue if it comes from growth and reform,” Boehner said. “Let’s start the discussion there.” ¶ Obama’s fresh political clout could extend to longer term fiscal policies beyond the fiscal cliff, though don’t expect GOP pushback to vanish. House Republicans still have plenty of fight in them. ¶ Comprehensive immigration reform — designed to smooth the path to citizenship while also strengthening the nation’s borders — also will be high on the president’s priority list. But unlike in his first term, when such a plan got little more than lip service in the face of staunch GOP opposition, Obama’s 3-to-1 support from Latinos on Election Day gives him the incentive to get it done. It also robs Republicans, who learned firsthand that dwindling support from Hispanics and other minority groups is costing them dearly, of any reason to stand in the way. ¶ An influx of new female voices in the Senate could also make Obama’s next four years the “Term of the Woman,” putting a new focus on equal pay and reproductive rights. ¶ U.S. Sen. Patty Murray of Washington state, who chairs the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, told reporters yesterday that having a historically high 20 women in the Senate in January won’t just mean more attention to women’s issues. She said the Senate will function better overall with “great women who have really strong voices” on board, such as U.S. Sen.-elect Elizabeth Warren. “There is no stronger advocate for middle-class Americans,” Murray said of Warren. ¶ None of this, of course, will be a cakewalk, but unlike his first term, Obama will have more power to push back.

#### Framing issue --- political capital controls uniqueness

**Rowland 11/7**/12 Writer at the Boston Globe

(Christopher and Scott Helman, Economy kept Obama afloat, blocked Romney win, Boston Globe, <http://bostonglobe.com/news/nation/2012/11/07/economy-kept-obama-afloat-blocked-romney-win/GGjoaHhlk06KobPutBJoSP/story.html>)

Next up for Obama is proving to those voters that he can achieve results. That remains an exceedingly difficult task in a deeply divided capital, with Republicans retaining control of the House on Tuesday and Democrats staying in charge in the Senate. Latinos who voted for Obama in large numbers Tuesday will demand that he seriously pursue immigration reform. Hurricane Sandy’s devastating effects in New York and New Jersey have renewed calls to address climate change.¶ Most immediately, the president and Congress will have to deal with the looming “fiscal cliff’’ — a set of automatic budget cuts that were put in place by Washington leaders to extract themselves from the 2011 debt-ceiling standoff, combined with the expiration of the George W. Bush-era tax cuts.¶ Economists warn that the nation will slide into another recession if the president and Congress do not come up with a plan to avoid the sudden shock to the economy that would result. How these fiscal talks proceed will depend on how much political capital Obama is perceived to have gained in the election. He was narrowly winning the popular vote as the ballots were tallied into Wednesday. If Republicans see political danger in continuing to dig in their heels, will they be more willing to negotiate a tax overhaul that includes higher taxes for the wealthy?

#### He has enough now.

**Cohen 11/7**/12 Formerly the executive editor of The American Prospect, Cohn is currently a senior editor at The New Republic magazine

(Jonathan Cohn, Yes, Obama Won a Mandate, <http://www.tnr.com/blog/plank/109818/obama-wins-four-more-years-mandate-agenda-validation-obamacare>)

But what about the next four years? Doesn’t Obama still need a governing plan? Sure. And if Obama has been relatively silent lately on some urgent issues—chief among them, climate change—he’s been quite clear when it comes to economic policy. He’s produced plans for strengthening the recovery. He’s laid out principles for reducing the deficit: Relatively modest reductions in spending coupled with higher taxes on the wealthy. And with the coming debate over the spending sequester and expiration of the Bush tax cuts, both set for January 2013, Obama will get a chance to apply those principles.¶ The stakes in this fight are large: Depending on the terms, they will define the scope of the federal government for at least a generation to come. And, unlike in recent fiscal debates, **Obama should have leverage**—more, perhaps, than at any time since the earliest days of his presidency. He can hold out in the debate over the sequester and Bush tax cuts, because the default action—doing nothing—is far worse for Republicans than it is for him. And with the newly elected Tammy Baldwin and Elizabeth Warren joining the reelected Sherrod Brown and Sheldon Whitehouse in the Senate, Obama should have a more unified and incrementally more liberal congressional party behind him. (Hopefully they will push Obama, even as they get his back.)

### Nuclear

#### SMRs are politically “nuclear”

Fairley 10

Peter, IEEE Spectrum, May, "Downsizing Nuclear Power Plants,” [spectrum.ieee.org/energy/nuclear/downsizing-nuclear-power-plants/0](http://spectrum.ieee.org/energy/nuclear/downsizing-nuclear-power-plants/0)

However, there are political objections to SMRs. Precisely because they are more affordable, they may well increase the risk of proliferation by bringing the cost and power output of nuclear reactors within the reach of poorer countries.¶ Russia’s first SMR, which the nuclear engineering group Rosatom expects to complete next year, is of particular concern. The Akademik Lomonosov is a floating nuclear power plant sporting two 35-MW reactors, which Rosatom expects to have tethered to an Arctic oil and gas operation by 2012. The reactor’s portability prompted Greenpeace Russia to call this floating plant the world’s most dangerous nuclear project in a decade**.¶** SMRs may be smaller than today’s reactors. But, politically at least, they’re just as nuclear.

### AT Tumpers

#### Fiscal cliff is before all that shit

**Klein 11-8** [Ezra Klein 11-8-2012 “Wonkbook: The election is over. Now the fiscal cliff begins.” New York Times http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/wp/2012/11/08/wonkbook-the-election-is-over-now-the-fiscal-cliff-begins/]

**25 problems for the second term: The postal service, the farm bill, cybersecurity, etc..**

**But the ‘fiscal cliff’ looks to be the first priority.** ”**The day after a hard-fought election** that left Barack Obama in the White House and control of Congress divided between the two parties, **the nation’s political leaders promised to try to avoid year-end spending cuts and tax increases** that threaten to push the U.S. back into recession…But the pressure is on. Deep, automatic federal-spending cuts and tax increases—a combination widely known as **the ‘fiscal clif’–will hit in January** unless Mr. Obama and Congress agree to some other way to reduce the budget deficit….Going over the cliff, economists say, would not only risk another recession, but would intensify anxiety about the dysfunction of the U.S. political system…**To tackle the fiscal cliff, Mr. Obama is expected to initiate a new round of talks with leaders of Congress. The goal would be a ‘grand bargain**’ combining higher taxes and money-saving changes to federal benefit programs.” Naftali Bendavid, Damian Paletta, and David Wessel in The Wall Street Journal.

**Negotiations are already happening.**

**Politico 11/8**/12 Washington Staff

(Behind Boehner's new tone, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1112/83608.html>)

Since Boehner gave the speech, Rep. Kevin McCarthy and his whip operation have called more than 120 House Republicans to gauge their reaction. By week’s end, they’ll have reached out to the entire House Republican Conference. When they return, McCarthy will meet with small groups of Republicans to feel them out for opposition.¶ At the staff level, the talks have **actually begun**. Boehner’s policy director, Brett Loper, has met informally with the Obama administration. Top aides to Boehner and Reid have also quietly huddled.¶ Inside Boehner’s operation, planning for these talks began in September on the second floor of the Capitol.¶ Boehner chief of staff Mike Sommers, Loper and Dave Schnittger — a Boehner hand from the Ohio Republican’s early days in D.C. — took to the famous “Board of Education” room to begin planning for two scenarios: a Romney win and an Obama victory.

#### Issues don’t cost capital until they are up

Drum ‘10

Kevin is a Columnist for Mother Jones, “Immigration Coming Off the Backburner,” <http://www.motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2010/03/immigration-coming-back-burner>

There's been plenty of overheated rhetoric and creative paranoia on display this year, but nativism has been, to me, the dog that didn't bark. The Tea Parties haven't been very focused on immigration, and while abortion and socialism both became major issues during health-care reform, fears that the bill would cover illegal immigrants (it won't, incidentally) never became a marquee issue.¶ Not to pick on Ezra or anything, but this attitude betrays a surprisingly common misconception about political issues in general. The fact is that political dogs never bark until an issue becomes an active one. Opposition to Social Security privatization was pretty mild until 2005, when George Bush turned it into an active issue. Opposition to healthcare reform was mild until 2009, when Barack Obama turned it into an active issue. Etc.¶ I only bring this up because we often take a look at polls and think they tell us what the public thinks about something. But for the most part, they don't.1 That is, they don't until the issue in question is squarely on the table and both sides have spent a couple of months filling the airwaves with their best agitprop. Polling data about gays in the military, for example, hasn't changed a lot over the past year or two, but once Congress takes up the issue in earnest and the Focus on the Family newsletters go out, the push polling starts, Rush Limbaugh picks it up, and Fox News creates an incendiary graphic to go with its saturation coverage — well, that's when the polling will tell you something. And it will probably tell you something different from what it tells you now.¶ Immigration was bubbling along as sort of a background issue during the Bush administration too until 2007, when he tried to move an actual bill. Then all hell broke loose. The same thing will happen this time, and without even a John McCain to act as a conservative point man for a moderate solution. The political environment is worse now than it was in 2007, and I'll be very surprised if it's possible to make any serious progress on immigration reform. "Love 'em or hate 'em," says Ezra, illegal immigrants "aren't at the forefront of people's minds." Maybe not. But they will be soon.¶ POSTSCRIPT: And keep in mind that one of the reasons the tea parties haven't (yet) taken up the immigration fight is very specific to the agenda of Dick Armey and FreedomWorks. I doubt that Armey will win this battle in the long run, though.¶ 1Granted, polls do give us a general idea of where we're starting from. If immigration reform were polling at 80%, for example, I'd feel pretty good about it since that number could deteriorate 20 points and it would still have a lot of support. But if it's polling at around 50-60% — which it is — that's dangerous territory. Once the yelling starts you can expect that number to go down a bunch, and suddenly it won't be a popular issue to tackle during an election year.

### AT Treasuries solve

#### Treasuries don’t solve - GDP

Reich 10-12

Robert is a former Secretary of the Treasury and a Professor at the University of California at Berkley, “How January’s Fiscal Cliff Turns into a Giant Hill by February or March,” <http://robertreich.org/>

¶ These are awkward days for deficit hawks who believe the American economy can get back to health only if the nation gets its fiscal house in order. If they get their wish, the economy goes over a cliff.¶ ¶ Regardless of what happens Election Day, at the beginning of next year more than $600 billion in tax increases and spending cuts automatically go into effect. That’s equivalent to about 5 percent of the entire U.S. economy, more than the projected growth of the whole gross domestic product next year.¶ ¶ The problem is, if we fall off this fiscal cliff we plunge into recession. That’s because the cliff withdraws too much demand from the economy too quickly, at a time when unemployment is still likely to be high.¶ ¶ The Congressional Budget Office projects real economic growth will drop at an annual rate of 2.9 percent in the first half of 2013, and unemployment will rise to 9.1 percent by the end of next year.¶ ¶ As Spain and Great Britain have demonstrated, launching fiscal austerity at a time when a nation’s economic capacity is substantially underutilized causes the economy to contract. This makes the debt even larger in proportion to the size of the economy. Rather than reassure global lenders and investors, it spooks them more.

#### Consumer Spending

Mellot 10-17

Darien is a Senior Research Analyst in the Salt Lake City office of CBRE, the world's largest commercial real estate firm, “Confidently heading toward the fiscal cliff,”

At the very least, it is apparent that businesses are aware of the cliff and it's beginning to influence their behavior. Why are businesses so concerned about the fiscal cliff? The reason so many are concerned with the fiscal cliff is due to its magnitude and the current state of the U.S. economy. Notable tax breaks set to expire at the end of the year include the Bush tax cuts, alternative minimum tax patch and payroll tax holiday. The Tax Policy Center estimates an average household will see their tax bill rise by $3,700 annually. All together, the tax cuts expiring are worth several hundred billion dollars annually, which will also be coupled with a potentially damaging mix of spending cuts, especially in relation to defense.¶ Related:¶ US housing construction jumps to 4-year high¶ U.S. builders started construction on homes in September at the fastest rate since July 2008 and made plans to build even more homes in the coming months. The gains show the housing recovery is strengthening and could help the economy grow.¶ As organizations analyze the impact of the fiscal cliff on their businesses, it is clearly unsettling. Consumer spending accounts for approximately 70 percent of economic activity in the U.S. Consequently, if the ability of consumers to spend is severely restricted by tax increases, demand for goods and services will fall. With the economy growing at a rate of under two percent, it will not be able to absorb such a shock, leading to a recession.

### Econ Collapse-> War

#### Economic Decline causes War- 1NC Kemp says it leads to radical governments and terrorism

#### More Reasons:

#### A Stats and History

**Royal 2010**

Jedediah, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises,” in Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, pg. 213-215)

Less intuitive is how periods of **economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict**. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that **rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the** often **bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next**. As such, exogenous shocks such as **economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power** (see also Gilpin. 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, **increasing the risk of miscalculation** (Feaver, 1995). Alternatively, **even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict** as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that '**future expectation of trade' is a** **significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states**. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, **if the expectations of future trade decline**, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, **the likelihood for conflict increases**, **as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could** potentially be the **trigger** for **decreased trade expectations** either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, **others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess** (2002) **find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during** periods of **economic downturn**. They write: The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the **presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other**. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. p. 89) **Economic decline has** also **been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism** (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. **"Diversionary theory" suggests** that, **when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline**, sitting **governments have increased incentives to fabricate external** **military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag'** **effect**. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995). and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that **the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states** than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that **periods of weak economic performance in the U**nited **S**tates, and thus weak Presidential popularity, **are statistically linked to an increase in the** **use of force**. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas **political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels**.5 This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

### WATER

### Accidents

#### A single accident the industry

Squassoni, ‘8

[Sharon, Senior Associate, Nonproliferation Program -- Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 3-12, “The Realities of Nuclear Expansion” Congressional Testimony: House Select Committee for Energy Independence and Global Warming, Washington, DC]

A few caveats with respect to projecting nuclear energy expansion are necessary. Nuclear energy is undoubtedly safer and more efficient now than when it began fifty years ago, but it still faces four fundamental challenges: waste, cost, proliferation, and safety. It is an inherently risky business. Most industry executives will admit that it will only take one significant accident to plunge the “renaissance” back into the nuclear Dark Ages. Because of this, estimates are highly uncertain. For example, the U.S. Energy Information Administration does not use its computer model to estimate nuclear energy growth because, among other things, key variables such as public attitudes and government policy are difficult to quantify and project. That said, estimates tend to extrapolate electricity consumption and demand from gross domestic product (GDP) growth, make assumptions about nuclear energy’s share of electricity production, and then estimate nuclear reactor capacity.

### Squo Solves

#### SQ solves

Csik 7 (Bela, IAEA Sr. Advisor, Nuclear cogeneration: Supplying heat for homes and industries, <http://www.ecolo.org/documents/documents_in_english/cogeneration-nuc-csik-07.html>)

The prospects for applying nuclear energy to district and process heating are closely tied to the prospects of deploying SMRs. A recent market assessment for SMRs found that 70 to 80 new units are planned in about 30 countries up to the year 2015. It was also found that about a third of these units are expected to be applied specifically to nuclear desalination. Of the rest, a substantial share could very well supply heat in addition to electric energy, while a few are expected to be heat-only reactors.

### Bad

#### Nuclear-powered desalination risks leaking radioactive waste – turns the advantage – from their author

IAEA 7

“Economics of Nuclear Desalination: New Developments and Site Specific Studies”, July, <http://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/publications/PDF/te_1561_web.pdf>

The overall safety issues associated with an integrated nuclear desalination facility are primarily those¶ associated with the nuclear plant itself [32]. Since these aspects are already taken care of in specific¶ reactor safety studies, this section will only address those specific safety issues caused by the coupling¶ between a reactor system and a desalination plant. These issues are related to:¶ • The potential for the transfer of radioactive materials from the nuclear plant to the desalination¶ system during normal operation or as a result of an incident or accident. This issue involves an¶ evaluation of the adequacy of the adopted containment-confinement boundaries in terms of¶ number of barriers and their effectiveness.¶ • The potential for more severe reactor system transients induced by transients in the¶ desalination plant, either during normal operation or as a result of an accident.¶ The safety impact of these issues is strongly dependent on the adopted coupling scheme. Safety¶ verification was therefore made in the context of the EURODESAL project [7] for the coupling¶ involving MED, RO and ROph processes. The Westinghouse AP-600 reactor was considered as the¶ reference nuclear plant [8]. Conclusions are however applicable to other PWRs and reactor types.¶ Similarly, the analysis deals with the case of backpressure coupling via PWR condensers. Again, the¶ conclusions would be equally valid for an extraction coupling.¶ 1.7.1. Safety barriers¶ The fact of coupling the nuclear reactor to any of the above mentioned processes does not reduce the¶ number of safety barriers as compared to the standard nuclear plant configuration. Thus the usual¶ barriers are maintained in all cases: fuel matrix, fuel cladding, primary circuit and the reactor¶ containment system. In the case of coupling through the condenser, an additional safety barrier are the¶ main condenser tubes.¶ In normal operation, the main condenser is at a lower pressure compared to its environment. There is¶ thus no leakage of the secondary side steam outside the condenser.¶ Nevertheless, the integration of the nuclear plant with the desalination system can lead to a¶ modification of the radioactive exposure pathways. This is due to the possibility that radioactive¶ materials could be released to the potable water — and not to the sea or to the river — through the¶ interface boundaries between the nuclear facility and the desalination system, e.g. main condenser or¶ main condenser cooling water. Potential radioactive releases can be a consequence of normal¶ operation routine releases — i.e. normal operating leakage at interface boundaries — or accidental¶ events.

#### Jacks up water prices – South Australia proves

Martin 12

“Desalination pushes up water prices in SA”¶ SARAH MARTIN, SA POLITICAL REPORTER The Australian May 22, 2012 http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/state-politics/desal-pushes-up-water-prices-in-sa/story-e6frgczx-1226362856286

WATER prices in South Australia will increase 25 per cent next year as the cost of the Adelaide desalination plant hits consumers with average annual water bills of more than $1200.¶ The base cost of water in SA has now increased almost five-fold since 2007 when the 100 gigalitre Port Stanvac desalination plant was first announced, from 50c to $2.42 a kilolitre.¶ Water use above 130 kL now costs $3.73 a kilolitre, more than triple the price five years ago and the highest in the country.

### WARMING

### 2NC Too Late

#### That’s sufficient to trigger their impact

Harvey 11

Harvey, environment reporter – the Guardian, 11/9/’11¶ (Fiona, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/nov/09/fossil-fuel-infrastructure-climate-change>)

Climate scientists estimate that global warming of 2C above pre-industrial levels marks the limit of safety, beyond which climate change becomes catastrophic and irreversible. Though such estimates are necessarily imprecise, warming of as little as 1.5C could cause dangerous rises in sea levels and a higher risk of extreme weather – the limit of 2C is now inscribed in international accords, including the partial agreement signed at Copenhagen in 2009, by which the biggest developed and developing countries for the first time agreed to curb their greenhouse gas output.

#### Here’s evidence in the context of nuclear

Madsen and Dutzik 9

\*Travis Madsen has worked with Frontier Group since 2002. His work has won coverage in a wide variety of local and national media outlets, including the *Wall Street Journal*, the *New York Times*, and the *Los Angeles Times*. Prior to joining Frontier Group in 2002, Travis completed a fellowship at the New Jersey Public Interest Research Group. Travis holds a bachelors degree in molecular biology and chemistry from the University of Colorado. \*\*Tony Dutzik is senior policy analyst with Frontier Group, specializing in energy, transportation and climate policy. He is the author of more than three dozen Frontier Group reports on these and other topics, and his research has received national media attention, gaining coverage in the *New York Times*, the *Wall Street Journal*, the Philadelphia Inquirer and other major media outlets. He holds a Master's degree in print journalism from Boston University and a Bachelor of Science degree in public service from Penn State University. [November 2009, “Generating Failure How Building Nuclear Power Plants Would Set America Back in the Race Against Global Warming,” Environment America Research & Policy Center, http://www.environmentamerica.org/sites/environment/files/reports/Generating-Failure---Environment-America---Web\_0.pdf]

Even Without Delays, the Nuclear Path Is Too Slow to Keep Global Warming Emissions Within Budget

Even with generous assumptions about speed and effectiveness, building 100 new reactors in the United States by 2030 will not reduce global warming pollution fast enough to keep our carbon emissions within budget – and therefore not fast enough to meet our goals for limiting the consequences of global warming.

First, assume that the nuclear industry can deliver on its ambitious timelines and successfully complete 100 new reactors (about 100 gigawatts of generation capacity) in two decades. Then, assume that every kilowatt-hour of nuclear power would displace coal, the largest source of carbon-intensive power generation. Finally, assume that next-generation nuclear reactors operate at an average of 90 percent of full capacity – an upper-bound estimate from a group of nuclear technology experts.106 Under these best-case conditions, building 100 active nuclear reactors could prevent more than 750 million metric tons of carbon dioxide (MMTCO2) pollution in 2030. Overall power plant emissions would be 20 percent below 2005 levels.

However, these nuclear reactors would not be able to reduce emissions while they are under construction. In other words, the nuclear path delivers a late start in cutting pollution. As a result, building 100 new reactors could only reduce cumulative power plant emissions of global warming pollution by 12 percent over the next two decades compared to doing nothing. (See Figure 5.) On this path, America would still exceed its 2010-2050 electric power emissions budget by 2025 – 25 years too soon. (See “Setting a Carbon Budget for the United States” on page 13 for a brief explanation of the source of the budget line represented in Figure 5.)

In conclusion, building 100 new nuclear reactors by 2030 would be too little, too late when it comes to preventing global warming pollution. By leading to a higher and later peak in emissions, using nuclear power as a primary strategy to address global warming would ensure that the United States exceeds its 2010-2050 power plant emissions budget. As a result the nuclear path would cut into what little margin of error we have, increasing the risk of catastrophic global warming.

## 1NR

#### Environmental security

# Round 8 v Michigan State

## 1NC

### 1Off

#### A) Interpretations:

#### 1. Augment means to increases something already developed

AHD 9

The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition copyright ©2000 by Houghton Mifflin Company. Updated in 2009.

**1.** To make (something already developed or well under way) greater, as in size, extent, or quantity:

#### B) Violation- fusion energy production exist doesn’t exist now- still in research phase

ASP 11/9

http://americansecurityproject.org/blog/2012/new-fusion-report-shift-focus-to-producing-practical-energy/

The first recommendation revolves around the notion that fusion energy research needs to be focused more on how to produce fusion for practical purposes – harnessing energy in a power plant. This would be a departure from the current focus, as EPRI suggests, which centers on basic research instead of how to produce practical energy. The second recommendation relates to the fact that one of the main technical barriers to producing net energy from fusion is in materials science. For in magnetic fusion devices – tokamaks – harness hot plasma to compress fuel. In Inertial fusion, lasers shoot fuel contained in a pellet. However, one major obstacle to both approaches is finding the right materials that can handle the extreme temperatures. If scientists can address that problem, one of the major technical hold-ups can be addressed.¶ The third recommendation – monitoring the status of fusion research – is an interesting one because as of right now, it is unclear which approach will be successful. Pursuing multiple options will increase the probability of success. However, periodically evaluating fusion programs will allow the fusion community to identify which approaches appear to be the most likely to lead to practical fusion power.¶ Once fusion research nears commercialization, EPRI provides two follow-on recommendations: the establishment of an advisory group of utilities to plan for fusion power plants; and the need to begin the regulatory framework for permitting and licensing. These two recommendations are important – once fusion power is proven to be viable, the electric power industry and the regulatory authorities need to be ready to pave the way for commercial fusion power.¶ Getting electrons on the grid from a fusion reactor will take time and investment. EPRI concluded, that “[u]ltimately, demonstration facilities sponsored by the U.S. Department of Energy will be required, just as was the case in the early days of water reactor technologies.”¶ EPRI concluded that all seven fusion proposals (which includes subcategories of Magnetic and Inertial fusion) are “worthy of continuing R&D funding but that none were ready to be exploited as near-term power sources.”

#### C) Vote neg

#### Limits – Including R&D Aff’s allows the Aff to develop any future energy source and claim unpredictable spin-off advantages not related to changing energy production.

#### No solvency- plan text as written makes zero sense because the funding for production doesn’t exist now-vote neg on presumption

### 3 Off

#### Cliff deal now but capital’s key

CSM 11-8

“Would Tea-Party Accept a Bill Clinton Brokered Deal with Obama?” <http://news.yahoo.com/tea-party-accept-bill-clinton-brokered-deal-obama-231119318.html>

Following the decisive victory by the man they vowed three-and-a-half years ago to pry out of the White House, the antigovernment tea party movement found itself reassessing its role within a fractured Republican Party that faced broad electoral disappointments on Election Day.¶ President Obama’s reelection represents the fifth time in the last six presidential cycles the Republican candidate has failed to win the popular vote. The GOP is now in full soul-searching mode, with the tea party especially facing criticism for its social and fiscal issue-driven co-opting of the Republican national agenda to which all contenders, including Mitt Romney, had to kneel during the primaries.¶ “In a lot of ways, the tea party movement was repudiated in the election,” says Joshua Dyck, a University of Massachusetts-Lowell political science professor and co-director of the Center for Public Opinion. “Part of the problem is that the tea party has had a hard time figuring out what it’s all about. Is it about Sarah Palin [social] conservatism or is the tea party about budget conservatism?”¶ Election 2012: 12 reasons Obama won and Romney lost¶ Yet tea party activists across the US also awoke Wednesday with the knowledge that their small government agenda still wields significant clout in the House, through which Obama must take any and all plans designed to raise taxes and slash a runaway deficit and mounting national debt.¶ Indeed, tea party activists – whose agenda has the approval of about a third of Americans – began quickly to sort through the electoral ashes, calibrating new ways to lead the GOP and achieve its chief goal – saving the republic from a looming calamity of fiscal profligacy.¶ “Defeat does not weaken the tea party,” says Brigitte Nacos, a political scientist at Columbia University who studies the GOP’s tea party splinter coalition. “The real topic is the tea party now, and it’s not only Republicans that have to deal with it, but also the president has to now deal with it.”¶ Yet given the country’s vote Tuesday, at least one tea party blogger suggested that studied compromise may have to replace the line-in-the-sand absolutism that left last year’s negotiations on the debt ceiling in bitter shambles and helped turn American opinion against the movement.¶ One suggestion floated by tea party members to break the fiscal gridlock would be to craft a spending deal similar to that struck by President Bill Clinton in 1997 – raising marginal tax rates across the board while slashing deficit spending. The tack, experts say, might allow a term-limited Obama to strike a substantial and meaningful across-the-aisle legislative deal to avoid potentially plunging the US into another recession.¶ Political scientists and tea party activists also suggested that such a deal could actually be brokered by the former president, as Professor Nocas says has been discussed, especially given Mr. Clinton’s 11th hour role on the Obama campaign trail.¶ “I definitely think it would behoove Obama to put Bill Clinton in charge of outreach, because Barack Obama frankly doesn’t know how to make a deal on the Hill,” says Scott Boston, a St. Louis-based tea party activist and blogger.¶ “The fact is, Bill Clinton’s budget was $1.2 trillion smaller than Obama’s budget, so, given that, though I’m not for higher taxes, I’m willing to trade a higher tax rate in return for $1.2 trillion in spending cuts,” Mr. Boston says. “Either way, we need to talk about the Clinton philosophy towards making the country go again, which was, ‘I’ll meet you on tax side if you meet on spending side.’ ”¶ “If they want to put that ’97 budget deal on the table, that sounds attractive to me,” says Matt Kibbe, the CEO of the anti-tax group Freedom Works and coauthor of “Give Us Liberty: A tea party manifesto.”¶ “It seems like there’s more pressure on the president,” says Kibbe. “We had a status quo election and the president must have known that this fiscal train wreck is coming, it’s there for everyone to see, and how is he going to lead in this situation? He’s not going to be able to demagogue the rich, because you could tax them at 100 percent and you couldn’t fix this problem.”¶ Indicating new Republican flexibility, House Speaker John Boehner (R) of Ohio said Wednesday that the GOP is open to discussing tax increases "under the right conditions" to get deficits under control.¶ Until now, Obama has pushed for more moderate deficit cuts offset by raising taxes on “the rich,” or couples making more than $250,000 a year. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the problem with Obama’s tack is that it doesn’t go far enough to reduce the deficit and the nation’s record $16 trillion debt in a significant way. The president has also refused to make deep cuts and reforms to social programs, as Republicans have demanded in their budgets.¶ A more likely scenario than Bill Clinton returning to the federal budget table is that establishment Republicans either have to maneuver the negotiations away from the House’s tea party coalition or force ultra-conservative members to bend into compromise – a tall order, suggests Professor Dyck, at the Center for Public Opinion.¶ “Can these people who have been lobbing bombs at each other, the president and the tea party, step away from the rhetorical campaign and come up with a negotiation on the fiscal cliff in about 16 days?” wonders Dyck. “I think the tea party is going to fight it kicking and screaming, because it is, ultimately, an ideologically pure movement.”¶ Indeed, moderate Republicans and right-leaning independents have argued that the tea party has pulled the GOP too far to the right while indulging out-of-the-mainstream scuttlebutt around Obama’s citizenship, racialized commentary, off-putting declarations about rape and women’s bodies, and xenophobic immigration talk.¶ But while there’s truth to those assertions, Tea Party Patriots co-founder Mark Meckler told The Boston Globe on Tuesday that the tea party’s impact has been far more profound than that.¶ “President Obama was forced in the debates to call himself the president of reining in big government. That was unthinkable four years ago,” Mr. Meckler said. “The entire nature of the debate in the United States has changed because of the tea party movement.”¶ National Review Online columnist Michael Tanner suggests the reelection of vice presidential candidate Paul Ryan back to the House (even as Wisconsin overall leaned to Obama) suggests that the core tea party message – smaller, less expensive central government – still resonates.¶ According to exit polls Tuesday, some 51 percent of voters say government already does too much, versus 44 percent who believe the government should do more.¶ “It’s important that Democratic efforts to turn the Ryan budget and Medicare into a bludgeon failed,” writes Mr. Tanner. “Democratic gains in the House were negligible; nearly all Republicans who voted for the Ryan budget were reelected,” and Romney fought Obama to a draw on Medicare issues in Florida.¶ The GOP’s civil war between moderates and small government tea party insurgents may come into focus quickly, and burn brightly, suggests Ms. Nacos. Yet Obama will hardly be able to stand idly by, enjoying the show, she adds.¶ “We will see very quickly with a lot of important issues in Congress whether there is less or more influence of the tea party, but this also depends what the Obama administration and Democrats do,” she says.¶ “The president really has to use his political capital the right way,” she adds, “and he now has an opportunity to be a better communicator, to explain to the public what is at stake and why things are not being done.”

#### Plan kills Obama

Petroleum Intelligence Weekly, 1/9

Obama Plays Safe on Energy Policy, 2012 Lexis

With less than a year to go until he faces re-election, US President Barack Obama is trying to avoid controversial energy policy decisions, postponing the finalization of restrictions on oil refinery and power plant emissions and delaying the approval of a major crude pipeline project. The president’s caution will prolong the status quo on issues where the industry both opposes and supports the administration’s plans, and also illustrates what's at stake for energy policy depending on whether or not Obama is given another four years in office. Most of Obama's original campaign pledges on promoting alternatives to fossil fuels and tackling climate change have not passed muster with Congress, most notably an ambitious plan for national carbon controls, a subsequent toned-down clean energy standard floated after the carbon legislation failed, and repeated efforts to repeal $30 billion-$40 billion worth of oil industry tax deductions over 10 years ( PIW May9'11 ). The one exception has been the passage of $90 billion in clean energy funding as part of an economic stimulus bill passed early in Obama's term, but the White House has been unable to repeat this success in other energy policy areas ( PIW Feb.23'09 ).

#### Causes Middle East War

Hutchison 12

Hutchison, U.S. Senator from the great state of Texas, 9/21/2012¶ (Kay Bailey, “A Looming Threat to National Security,” States News Service, Lexis)

Despite warnings of the dire consequences, America is teetering at the edge of a fiscal cliff, with January 1st, 2013 as the tipping point. On that date, unless Congress and the White House can reach agreement on how to cut the federal deficit, all taxpayers will be hit with higher taxes and deep cuts - called "sequestration" - will occur in almost all government spending, disrupting our already weak economy and putting our national security at risk.¶ According to the House Armed Services Committee, if sequestration goes into effect, it would put us on course for more than $1 trillion in defense cuts over the next 10 years. What would that mean? A huge hit to our military personnel and their families; devastating cuts in funding for critical military equipment and supplies for our soldiers; and **a** potentially **catastrophic blow to our** national defense and **security capabilities** in a time of increasing violence and danger.¶ All Americans feel a debt of gratitude to our men and women who serve in uniform. But Texas in particular has a culture that not only reveres the commitment and sacrifice they make to protect our freedom, we send a disproportionate number of our sons and daughters to serve.¶ The burden is not borne solely by those who continue to answer the call of duty, but by their families as well, as they endure separation and the anxiety of a loved one going off to war. These Americans have made tremendous sacrifices. They deserve better than to face threats to their financial security and increased risks to their loved ones in uniform, purely for political gamesmanship.¶ Sequestration would also place an additional burden on our economy. In the industries that support national defense, as many as 1 million skilled workers could be laid off. With 43 straight months of unemployment above 8 percent, it is beyond comprehension to add a virtual army to the 23 million Americans who are already out of work or under-employed. **Government and private economic forecasters warn that sequestration will push the country back into recession next year**.¶ The recent murder of our Ambassador to Libya and members of his staff, attacks on US embassies and consulates and continued riots across the Middle East and North Africa are stark reminders that great portions of the world remain volatile and hostile to the US. **We have the mantle of responsibility that being the world's lone super-power brings**. **In the absence of U.S. military leadership**, **upheaval in the Middle East would be worse**. **As any student of history can attest**, **instability does not confine itself to national borders**. **Strife that starts in one country can spread like wildfire across a region**.¶ Sequestration's cuts would reduce an additional 100,000 airmen, Marines, sailors and soldiers. That would leave us with the smallest ground force since 1940, the smallest naval fleet since 1915 and the smallest tactical fighter force in the Air Force's history. With the destabilization in the Middle East and other areas tenuous, we would be left with a crippled military, **a diminished stature internationally and a loss of technological** research, development and **advantage** - just as actors across the globe are increasing their capabilities.¶ Sequestration can still be avoided. **But that will require leadership from the President** that has thus far been missing. Congress and the White House must reach a long-term agreement to reduce $1 trillion annual budget deficits, without the harsh tax increases that could stall economic growth and punish working families.

#### Middle East goes nuclear

Russell 9

James A. Russell, Senior Lecturer, National Security Affairs, Naval Postgraduate School, ‘9 (Spring) “Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prospects for Escalation and Nuclear War in the Middle East” IFRI, Proliferation Papers, #26, http://www.ifri.org/downloads/PP26\_Russell\_2009.pdf

**Strategic stability in the region is** thus **undermined by** various factors: (1) asymmetric interests in the bargaining framework that can introduce unpredictable behavior from actors; (2) **the presence of non-state actors that introduce unpredictability into relationships between the antagonists**; (3) **incompatible assumptions about** the structure of **the deterrent relationship that makes** the **bargaining** framework strategically **unstable;** (4) **perceptions by Israel and the United States that its window of opportunity** for military **action is closing, which could prompt a preventive attack**; (5) the prospect that Iran’s response to pre-emptive attacks could involve unconventional weapons, which could prompt escalation by Israel and/or the United States; (6) **the lack of a communications framework to build trust and cooperation among framework participants**. These systemic weaknesses in the coercive bargaining framework all suggest that escalation by any the parties could happen either on purpose or as a result of miscalculation or the pressures of wartime circumstance. Given these factors**, it is disturbingly easy to imagine scenarios under which a conflict could quickly escalate in which the regional antagonists would consider the use of** **chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons**. **It would be a mistake to believe the nuclear taboo can somehow magically keep nuclear weapons from being used** **in the context of an unstable strategic framework.** **Systemic asymmetries** between actors in fact s**uggest** a certain increase in **the probability of war** – a war in which escalation could happen quickly and from a variety of participants. **Once such a war starts, events would likely develop a momentum all their own** and decision-making would consequently be shaped in unpredictable ways. The international community must take this possibility seriously, and muster every tool at its disposal to prevent **such an outcom**e, which **would be an unprecedented disaster for the** peoples of the **region, with substantial risk for the entire world**.

### 4 Off

#### The State and Territorial Governments in the Department of Energy’s Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research should substantially augment funding for federal programs for production of magnetic fusion energy in the United States.

#### DOE EPSCoR program empirically funds fusion research at national labs, including STEM students – states can contribute funds

Gary C. April, PhD, Associate Director Alabama DOE EPSCoR, 2005, “Alabama DOE EPSCoR,” http://www.netl.doe.gov/publications/proceedings/05/EPSCoR/pdf/abstracts/powell-abstract.pdf

The Alabama DOE EPSCoR Program is made up of three integrated components including Program Coordination, Human Resources Development, and Energy Research Clusters. All programmatic elements are coordinated through a statewide steering committee. The first Implementation Award for the Alabama DOE EPSCoR Program (1994-2000) had three energy research clusters: Fusion Energy, Novel Organic Semiconducting Materials, and Petroleum Reservoir Characterization. Alabama’s second Implementation Award (2001- 2007) builds on the success of these clusters and expands the interest and focus of energy related research through Fuel Cell technology and manufacturing. Collectively, the success of the first three energy research clusters can be measured against the record that they established during the six-year tenure of their work. For an investment of $3.4 MM from DOE and $4.4MM from institutional/state matching, these programs supported the research of: a) 21 research professors, b) 32 post-doctoral associates, c) 40 doctoral-level graduate students, and d) 41 undergraduate research students. Their research also brought in an additional $18MM in non-DOE EPSCoR funding. Add to these numbers the $1.5MM from DOE, state and institutional sources for Human Resources Development activities elevating energy awareness among K – post doctoral participants, an additional $1.2MM from DOE Traineeship Awards and success in the DOE State Laboratory Partnership Awards by six investigators at a total of nearly $2.1MM and the true impact of the support base for energy-related programs in Alabama is quite evident. The Fuel Cell energy research cluster is located at the University of Alabama and Alabama A&M University (HBCU). The program is in its fourth year of the second Implementation Award. DOE awarded the Fuel Cell group a total of $1.2MM for four years with matching support from institutional/state matching. To date, the program has supported: a) 13 research faculty, b) 10 undergraduates, c) 15 graduates, and d) three post-doctoral associates. Their research has thus far produced an additional $5MM in non-DOE EPSCoR funding. The Human Resources Development Travel and Enhancement Grant Programs are intended to help cover the costs incurred by young Alabama researchers seeking an opportunity to visit a Federal Laboratory for the purpose of on-site research or developing collaborative research between institutions. Since the programs were initiated, 12 research faculty from four EPSCoR institutions, including one HBCU, one visiting scholar, one undergraduate student, 10 graduate students, and one post-doctoral associate have participated in research efforts at Argonne, Oak Ridge, Los Alamos, and the Pacific Northwest National Laboratories.

### 5 off

#### THE AFFIRMATIVE’S STRATEGY OF ENERGY SECURITIZATION EMPIRICALLY FAILS TO MOTIVATE SUCCESSFUL ACTION, BECOMES A SELF-FULFILLING PROPHECY, AND NECCISATES MILITARY INTERVENTION

Ahmed 11

Dr. Nafeez Mosaddeq Ahmed is Executive Director of the Institute for Policy Research and Development (IPRD), an independent think tank focused on the study of violent conflict, he has taught at the Department of International Relations, University of Sussex "The international relations of crisis and the crisis of international relations: from the securitisation of scarcity to the militarisation of society" Global Change, Peace & Security Volume 23, Issue 3, 2011 Taylor Francis

The twenty-ﬁrst century heralds the unprecedented acceleration and convergence of multiple, interconnected global crises – climate change, energy depletion, food scarcity, and economic instability. While the structure of global economic activity is driving the unsustainable depletion of hydrocarbon and other natural resources, this is simultaneously escalating greenhouse gas emissions resulting in global warming. Both global warming and energy shocks are impacting detrimentally on global industrial food production, as well as on global ﬁnancial and economic instability. Conventional policy responses toward the intensiﬁcation of these crises have been decidedly inadequate because scholars and practitioners largely view them as separate processes. Yet increasing evidence shows they are deeply interwoven manifestations of a global political economy that has breached the limits of the wider environmental and natural resource systems in which it is embedded. In this context, orthodox IR’s ﬂawed diagnoses of global crises lead inexorably to their ‘securitisation’, reifying the militarisation of policy responses, and naturalising the proliferation of violent conﬂicts. Global ecological, energy and economic crises are thus directly linked to the ‘Otherisation’ of social groups and problematisation of strategic regions considered pivotal for the global political economy. Yet this relationship between global crises and conﬂict is not necessary or essential, but a function of a wider epistemological failure to holistically interrogate their structural and systemic causes. In 2009, the UK government’s chief scientiﬁc adviser Sir John Beddington warned that without mitigating and preventive action ‘drivers’ of global crisis like demographic expansion, environmental degradation and energy depletion could lead to a ‘perfect storm’ of simultaneous food, water and energy crises by around 2030. 1 Yet, for the most part, conventional policy responses from national governments and international institutions have been decidedly inadequate. Part of the problem is the way in which these crises are conceptualised in relation to security. Traditional disciplinary divisions in the social and natural sciences, compounded by bureaucratic compartmentalisation in policy-planning and decision-making, has meant these crises are frequently approached as largely separate processes with their own internal dynamics. While it is increasingly acknowledged that cross-disciplinary approaches are necessary, these have largely failed to recognise just how inherently interconnected these crises are. As Brauch points out, ‘most studies in the environmental security debate since 1990 have ignored or failed to integrate the contributions of the global environmental change community in the natural sciences. To a large extent the latter has also failed to integrate the results of this debate.’ 2 Underlying this problem is the lack of a holistic systems approach to thinking about not only global crises, but their causal origins in the social, political, economic, ideological and value structures of the contemporary international system. Indeed, it is often assumed that these contemporary structures are largely what need to be ‘secured’ and protected from the dangerous impacts of global crises, rather than transformed precisely to ameliorate these crises in the ﬁrst place. Consequently, policy-makers frequently overlook existing systemic and structural obstacles to the implementation of desired reforms. In a modest effort to contribute to the lacuna identiﬁed by Brauch, this paper begins with an empirically-oriented, interdisciplinary exploration of the best available data on four major global crises – climate change, energy depletion, food scarcity and global ﬁnancial instability – illustrating the systemic interconnections between different crises, and revealing that their causal origins are not accidental but inherent to the structural failings and vulnerabilities of existing global political, economic and cultural institutions. This empirical evaluation leads to a critical appraisal of orthodox realist and liberal approaches to global crises in international theory and policy. This critique argues principally that orthodox IR reiﬁes a highly fragmented, de-historicised ontology of the international system which underlies a reductionist, technocratic and compartmentalised conceptual and methodological approach to global crises. Consequently, rather than global crises being understood causally and holistically in the systemic context of the structure of the international system, they are ‘securitised’ as ampliﬁers of traditional security threats, requiring counter-productive militarised responses and/or futile inter-state negotiations. While the systemic causal context of global crisis convergence and acceleration is thus elided, this simultaneously exacerbates the danger of reactionary violence, the problematisation of populations in regions impacted by these crises and the naturalisation of the consequent proliferation of wars and humanitarian disasters. This moves us away from the debate over whether resource ‘shortages’ or ‘abundance’ causes conﬂicts, to the question of how either can generate crises which undermine conventional socio-political orders and confound conventional IR discourses, in turn radicalising the processes of social polarisation that can culminate in violent conﬂict.

#### THE 1AC’S SECURITIZING PERFORMANCE OF ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT ENSURES LONG-TERM ENVIRONMENTAL DESTRUCTION BY ORGANIZING IT AS A PROBLEM TO BE SOLVED BY INTERESTED ACTORS. THE ALTERNATIVE IS AN ACT OF RE-WRITING ECOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS BEYOND SECURITY’S DESTRUCTIVE FRAMEWORK

Cudworth and Hobden 2k10

[Erika and Stephen professors university of east London securing what for whom? Multiple complex inequalities and the politics of environmental security in Europe European Consortium for Political Research]

A full discussion of the concepts that underlie the notion of complex ecology is developed in our forthcoming book on the environment and/in international relations (Cudworth and Hobden 2011). Here we point to the main features of such an approach. A complexity-inspired approach to environmental issues in international relations would constitute a distinct form of analysis compared to ‘environmental conflict’ and ‘environmental security’ approaches. Such an approach gives priority to developing an understanding of social political and economic relations as impacting beyond the human. While human and non‐human systems have distinct features ultimately they are co‐constitutive overlapping and intersected. Rather than seeing a separation between the human and the non‐human complex ecologism sees the human world as embedded within the natural world with the variety of human social systems intersecting with those of other natural systems. Varied social systems overlap and intersect with resulting implications for a range of other natural systems (species scapes and the wider biosphere). The notion of panarchy described in the previous section provides an effective depiction of the sets of inter‐relating systems. There are a few attempts to deploy complexity in ‘ecological security approaches’. Harrison for example identifies ‘four principle concepts of complexity adapted to ecological systems’: adaptive agency self‐organizing emergence authority and openness’ (2006: 55). There are two major difficulties with Harrison’s application of complexity concepts: dualism and0 the eliding of power relations. Harrison discusses the concept of agency entirely in relation to the subjectivity and adaptation strategies of human beings in the context of environmental change. Second in his discussions of self‐organisation and emergence he stresses the bottom‐up interconnections and processes for example in environmental policy making. In Harrison’s interconnected non‐linear systems natural and social systems are analytically separate and politics is lost – there is no understanding of power in the social world here or its impact on non‐human systems. Whilst ‘ecological security’ firmly places the analysis of political social and economic relations within the global environmental system and pays attention to regional differences it does not account for the full range of complex social inequalities that shape human relations with and within environments. The contribution of a complex ecology approach is the potential to analyse intersectionality and multiple power relations. As discussed above a variety of different sets of power relations have been analysed by political ecologists. These represent the operation of different sets of systems such as patriarchal capitalist ethnocentrist and so on which can have an impact on each other and have implications for the environment. We would argue that while these can be considered as distinct systems the development path of each has implications for other systems. This allows for the development of multiple levels of analysis drawing the focus away from the state to supra‐state levels (including the biosphere) and sub‐state levels. Environmental issues can therefore be analysed operating at a variety of levels. Complex ecologism provides a means of overcoming the weaknesses in the range of environmental securitization approaches as discussed in the first section of this paper. By moving away from a state focussed framework and considering a panarchy of inter‐linked systems environmental problems can be considered at global regional and local levels. The biosphere itself is asystem co‐constitutive with other human and non‐human systems.Envisioning human systems embedded within a wider range of systems overcomes the duality inherent in the majority of approaches to understanding environmental issues within international relations. The environment is not “out there” but instead constitutive of and reactive to human systems. Human systems are embedded within a number of non‐human systems with the consequence that developments in one system mayhave implications elsewhere in the panarchy. Thus as a simple exampleincreased carbon dioxide levels as a result of increased industrialisation can be linked to species migration in local ecological systems. Likewise global temperature rises can increase energy use for example to run cooling systems impacting across economic (oil prices) political (inter‐state relations) and ethnic systems (relations with Islamic European populations)1 The interlinking of complex systems also allows the analysis to shiftfrom a focus on security to one of insecurity. Complex ecologism understandsinteractions and changes in complex human/natural systems as resulting in multiple risks hazards and uncertainties which international politics mustnavigate. A significant feature of current global environmental issues is thatmany of those most in a situation of risk are not the authors of the causes ofthat risk. Environmental risk situations faced by individuals communities and societies are frequently the consequences of complex power inter‐ relationships. More developed societies have been effective at exporting their environmental degradation gaining the benefits of industrial production without the inherent costs. Finally by focussing on the intersection of power relations operating in and between different systems and the creation of risk that is associated with relations between systems the possibilities for a mitigation of risk throughout the panarchy become the key issue. The move from ‘security’ to ‘risk alleviation’ implies that the focus of attention is on the restructuring of risk creating activities rather than attempts to secure protection for specific groups. By breaking the link between this as a state-focussed issue and instead a concentration on an analysis focussed on intersecting systems removes the focus on particular social groups and re-orientates the analysis towards both a concern for the wider biosphere and social justice. As manyothers have pointed out work on environmental change in international relations theory has tended to modify existing approaches by including the environment in pre‐existing frameworks such as securitization. Perspectives such as ‘ecological security’ which attempt a radical questioning and transformation of that framework are still shaped by it. We need to move beyond securitization but in policy terms it seems the notion of security has been attractive and it frames environmental policies alongside initiatives for ‘mitigation’ of and ‘adaptation’ to environmental ‘problems’.

### Solvency

#### No fusion

Brumfiel 12

Geoff Brumfiel, Scientific American, June 2012, Fusion's Missing Pieces, EBSCO

Scientists such as Lee have been seduced by fusion for half a century. Many before him have promised its impending arrival. Although some of those researchers were charlatans, the vast majority of them turned out to be plain wrong. Fusion is tough, and nature breaks promises.¶ Here is the core challenge: because hydrogen ions repel one another, scientists must slam them together to make them fuse. ITER's strategy is to heat the hydrogen inside a magnetic cage. The particular type of magnetic cage it employs is called a tokamak -- a metal doughnut circled by loops of coil that generate magnetic fields. These magnetic cuffs squeeze a charged plasma of hydrogen ions as it warms to hundreds of millions of degrees -- temperatures no solid material can withstand.¶ In the 1970s tokamaks looked so promising that some researchers predicted they could build fusion electricity plants by the mid-1990s. The only challenge was scaling research reactors up to sufficient size -- in general, the bigger the tokamak, the hotter the plasma can get, and the more efficient fusion becomes.¶ Then problems arose. Plasma conducts electricity and so can suffer from self-generated currents that make it buck and writhe. Violent turbulence snaps the plasma out of its cage, firing it toward the machine's wall. As the temperature rises, the tokamak grows to give the plasma space, and the magnetic fields need to be stronger to hold it. Extra room and stronger magnetic fields require higher electric current in the doughnut's copper coils. And higher current requires more power. Put simply: the larger and more powerful a machine becomes, the more energy it consumes trying to hold everything together.¶ This feedback meant that conventional tokamaks would never produce more energy than they consumed. Lee and others knew of only one solution: superconductors -- special materials that, at very low temperatures, can carry extremely high current with no resistance. If a tokamak's magnets were superconducting, they could be pumped up with current and left to run indefinitely. It would solve the energy problem but would not be cheap. Superconductors are exotic, expensive materials. And to work, they need to be constantly cooled with liquid helium to just four kelvins above absolute zero.

#### Err neg—this is nonsense

Rhodes 12

Chris Rhodes, Sussex University, Physical Chemistry Professor, 6/10/12, The Progress made in the Different Fields of Nuclear Fusion, oilprice.com/Alternative-Energy/Nuclear-Power/The-Progress-made-in-the-Different-Fields-of-Nuclear-Fusion.html

When I was about 10, I recall hearing that nuclear fusion power would become a reality "in about thirty years". The estimate has increased steadily since then, and now, forty odd years on, we hear that fusion power will come on-stream "in about fifty years". So, what is the real likelihood of fusion-based power stations coming to our aid in averting the imminent energy crisis? Getting two nuclei to fuse is not easy, since both carry a positive charge and hence their natural propensity is to repel one another. Therefore, a lot of energy is required to force them together so that they can fuse. To achieve this, suitable conditions of extremely high temperature, comparable to those found in stars, must be met. A specific temperature must be reached in order for particular nuclei to fuse with one another. This is termed the "critical ignition temperature", and is around 400 million degrees centigrade for two deuterium nuclei to fuse, while a more modest 100 million degrees is sufficient for a deuterium nucleus to fuse with a tritium nucleus. For this reason, it is deuterium-tritium fusion that is most sought after, since it should be most easily achieved and sustained.¶ One disadvantage of tritium is that it is radioactive and decays with a half-life of about 12 years, and consequently, it exists naturally in only negligible amounts. However, tritium may be "bred" from lithium using neutrons produced in an initial deuterium-tritium fusion. Ideally, the process would become self-sustaining, with lithium fuel being burned via conversion to tritium, which then fuses with deuterium, releasing more neutrons. While not unlimited, there are sufficient known resources of lithium to fire a global fusion programme for about a thousand years, mindful that there are many other uses for lithium, ranging for various types of battery to medication for schizophrenics. The supply would be effectively limitless if lithium could be extracted from the oceans.¶ In a working scenario, some of the energy produced by fusion would be required to maintain the high temperature of the fuel such that the fusion process becomes continuous. At the temperature of around 100 - 300 million degrees, the deuterium/lithium/tritium mixture will exist in the form of a plasma, in which the nuclei are naked (having lost their initial atomic electron clouds) and are hence exposed to fuse with one another.¶ The main difficulty which bedevils maintaining a working fusion reactor which might be used to fire a power station is containing the plasma, a process usually referred to as "confinement" and the process overall as “magnetic confinement fusion” (MCF). Essentially, the plasma is confined in a magnetic bottle, since its component charged nuclei and electrons tend to follow the field of magnetic force, which can be so arranged that the lines of force occupy a prescribed region and are thus centralised to a particular volume. However, the plasma is a "complex" system that readily becomes unstable and leaks away. Unlike a star, the plasma is highly rarefied (a low pressure gas), so that the proton-proton cycle that powers the sun could not be thus achieved on earth, as it is only the intensely high density of nuclei in the sun's core that allows the process to occur sustainably, and that the plasma is contained within its own gravitational mass, and isolated within the cold vacuum of space.¶ In June 2005, the EU, France, Japan, South Korea, China and the U.S. agreed to spend $12 billion to build an experimental fusion apparatus (called ITER) by 2014. It is planned that ITER will function as a research instrument for the following 20 years, and the knowledge gained will provide the basis for building a more advanced research machine. After another 30 years, if all goes well, the first commercial fusion powered electricity might come on-stream.¶ The Joint European Torus (JET)¶ I attended a fascinating event recently - a Cafe' Scientifique meeting held in the town of Reading in South East England. I have also performed in this arena, talking about "What Happens When the Oil Runs Out?", which remains a pertinent question. This time it was the turn of Dr Chris Warrick from the Culham Centre for Fusion Energy based near Abingdon in Oxfordshire, which hosts both the MAST (Mega Amp Spherical Tokamak) and the better known JET (Joint European Torus) experiments. In the audience was a veteran engineer/physicist who had worked on the pioneering ZETA4 experiment in the late 1950s, from which neutrons were detected leading to what proved later to be false claims that fusion had occurred, their true source being different versions of the same instability processes that had beset earlier machines.¶ Nonetheless, his comment was salient: "In the late 50s, we were told that fusion power was 20 years away and now, 50-odd years later it is maybe 60 years away." Indeed, JET has yet to produce a positive ratio of output power/input energy, and instability of the plasma is still a problem. Dr Warrick explained that while much of the plasma physics is now sorted-out, minor aberrations in the magnetic field allow some of the plasma to leak out, and if it touches the far colder walls of the confinement chamber, it simply "dies". In JET it is fusion of nuclei of the two hydrogen isotopes, deuterium and tritium that is being undertaken, a process that as noted earlier, requires a "temperature" of 100 million degrees.¶ I say "temperature" because the plasma is a rarefied (very low pressure) gas, and hence the collisions between particles are not sufficiently rapid that the term means the same distribution of energy as occurs under conditions of thermal equilibrium. It is much the same as the temperatures that may be quoted for molecules in the atmospheric region known as the thermosphere which lies some 80 kilometres above the surface of the Earth. Here too, the atmosphere is highly rarefied and thus derived temperatures refer to translational motion of molecules and are more usefully expressed as velocities. However expressed, at 100 million degrees centigrade, the nuclei of tritium and deuterium have sufficient translational velocity (have enough energy) that they can overcome the mutual repulsion arising from their positive charges and come close enough that they are drawn together by attractive nuclear forces and fuse, releasing vast amounts of energy in the process.¶ JET is not a small device, at 18 metres high, but bigger machines will be necessary before the technology is likely to give out more energy than it consumes. Despite the considerable volume of the chamber, it contains perhaps only one hundredth of a gram of gas, hence its very low pressure. There is another matter and that is how long the plasma and hence energy emission can be sustained. Presently it is fractions of a second but a serious "power station" would need to run for some hours. There is also the problem of getting useful energy from the plasma to convert into electricity even if the aforementioned and considerable problems can be overcome and a sustainable, large-scale plasma maintained.¶ The plan is to surround the chamber with a "blanket" of lithium with pipes running through it and some heat-exchanger fluid passing through them. The heated fluid would then pass on its heat to water and drive a steam-turbine, in the time-honoured fashion used for fossil fuel fired and nuclear power plants. Now my understanding is that this would not be lithium metal but some oxide material. The heat would be delivered in the form of very high energy neutrons that would be slowed-down as they encounter lithium nuclei on passing through the blanket. In principle this is a very neat trick, since absorption of a neutron by a lithium nucleus converts it to tritium, which could be fed back into the plasma as a fuel. Unlike deuterium, tritium does not exist is nature, being radioactive with a half-life of about 12 years. However produced, either separately or in the blanket, lithium is the ultimate fuel source, not tritium per se. Deuterium does exist in nature but only to the extent of one part in about two thousand of ordinary hydrogen (protium) and hence the energy costs of its separation are not inconsiderable.¶ The neutron flux produced by the plasma is very high, and to enhance the overall breeding efficiency of lithium to tritium the reactor would be surrounded with a “lithium” blanket about three feet thick. The intense neutron flux will render the material used to construct the reactor highly radioactive, to the extent that it would not be feasible for operators to enter its vicinity for routine maintenance. The radioactive material will need to be disposed of similarly to the requirements for nuclear waste generated by nuclear fission, and hence fusion is not as "clean" as is often claimed. Exposure to radiation of many potential materials necessary to make the reactor, blanket, and other components such as the heat-exchanger pipes would render them brittle, and so compromise their structural integrity. There is also the possibility that the lithium blanket around the reactor might be replaced by uranium, so enabling the option of breeding plutonium for use in nuclear weapons.¶ Providing a fairly intense magnetic field to confine the plasma (maybe Tesla - similar to that in a hospital MRI scanner) needs power (dc not ac as switching the polarity of the field would cause the plasma to collapse) and large power-supply units containing a lot of metals including rare earths which are mined and processed using fossil fuels. The issue of rare earths is troublesome already, and whether enough of them can be recovered to meet existing planned wind and electric car projects is debatable, let alone that additional pressure should be placed upon an already fragile resource to build a first generation of fusion power stations.¶ World supplies of lithium are also already stressed, and hence getting enough of it not only to make blankets for fusion reactors and tritium production but also for the millions-scale fleet of electric vehicles needed to divert our transportation energy demand away from oil is probably a bridge too far, unless we try getting it from seawater, which takes far more energy than mining lithium minerals. The engineering requirements too will be formidable, however, most likely forcing the need to confront problems as yet unknown, and even according to the most favourable predictions of the experts, fusion power is still 60 years away, if it will arrive at all. Given that the energy crisis will hit hard long before then, I suggest we look to more immediate solutions, mainly in terms of energy efficiency, for which there is ample scope.¶ To quote again the ZETA veteran, "I wonder if maybe man is not intended to have nuclear fusion," and all in all, other than from solar energy I wonder if he is right. At any rate, garnering real electrical power from fusion is so far distant as to have no impact on the more immediately pressing fossil fuels crisis, particularly for oil and natural gas. Fusion Power is a long-range "holy grail" and part of the illusion that humankind can continue in perpetuity to use energy on the scale that it presently does. Efficiency and conservation are the only real means to attenuate the impending crisis in energy and resources.

#### No commercialization—definitely not fast

Brumfiel 12

Geoff Brumfiel, Scientific American, June 2012, Fusion's Missing Pieces, EBSCO

ITER will prove whether fusion is achievable. It will not prove whether it is commercially viable. There is good reason to think it might not be. For starters, the radiation from fusion is very intense and will damage ordinary material such as steel. A power plant will have to incorporate some as yet undeveloped materials that can withstand years of bombardment from the plasma -- otherwise the reactor will be constantly down for servicing. Then there is the problem of tritium fuel, which must be made on-site, probably by using the reactor's own radiation.¶ Arguably the greatest obstacle to building a reactor based on ITER is the machine's incredible complexity. All the specialized heating systems and custom-built parts are fine in an experiment, but a power plant will need to be simpler, says Steve Cowley, CEO of the U.K.'s Atomic Energy Authority. "You can't imagine producing power day in and day out on a machine that's all bells and whistles," he says. Another generation of expensive demonstration reactors must be built before fusion can come onto the grid. Given ITER's lumbering development, none of these will be up and running before the middle of the century.

#### Throwing money at fusion does nothing

Economist 02

The Economist 364. 8282 (Jul 20, 2002): 69-70. Science and Technology: It's impossible. And what's more, it's improbable; Nuclear fusion, PROQUEST,

SOME say that **a dollar spent on nuclear fusion is a dollar wasted**. **And many, many dollars have been spent on it, as physicists try to duplicate, in a controlled setting, the process by which the sun shines**. **Since 1951, America alone has devoted more than $17 billion** (see chart on next page) **to working out how to fuse atomic nuclei so as to generate an inexhaustible supply of clean, safe power. The claim that this money is wholly wasted may not be entirely fair, though. Fusion science has made a big return on this investment in the form of a new universal constant. This constant is the number 30, a figure that has for the past half-century or so been cited almost religiously by researchers as the number of years that it will take before fusion power becomes a commercial reality.**

### STEM

#### No US-China War – econ, deterrence, resilient relations

Harding 12

(Harry, American political scientist specializing in Chinese politics and foreign affairs, founding dean of the Batten School of Leadership and Public Policy at the University of Virginia, previously served as dean of the Elliott School of International Affairs, advised several US Presidents on developments in the PRC; August, “American Visions of the Future of U.S.-China Relations: Competition, Cooperation, and Conflict,” in Tangled Titans, ed. David Shambaugh, Rowland & Littlefield, p. 406 – Kurr)

Fortunately, an essentially confrontational relationship is also unlikely, especially in the sense of a direct military conflict. The high degree of economic interdependence between the two countries has already created a relatively resilient relationship since the costs of a fundamental break between the two countries would be very high for each of them.24 Equally important, the cost of military conflict, especially given the fact that both China and the U.S. are nuclear powers, will be a significant deterrent against military conflict. Although China and the U.S. may not be compelled to cooperate, in other words, they may be compelled to avoid confrontation. Moreover, the probability of the most worrying of the triggers events identified above – a unilateral declaration of independence by Taiwan – is presently quite low, as is the risk that China would try to compel unification through the use of force. In this case a system of mutual deterrence prevents any party from crossing any of the other’s “red lines,” which have been clearly identified and communicated. Another possible trigger event, the collapse of the North Korean regime, has a somewhat higher probability, and the two countries’ red lines are less clear, but their ability to communicate quickly and avoid open conflict over that issue, while worth bolstering, is probably adequate, unless the overall relationship had deteriorated further prior to the event. Here again, mutual deterrence will play an important role in preventing the descent into military confrontation.

#### STEM is fine, and they can’t solve

Mervis 12

Science magazine deputy news editor ¶ (Jeffrey, "What If the Science Pipeline Isn't Really Leaking?," Science, July 2012, 337.6092, Science Magazine, accessed 10-8-12, mss)

However, a new book on the overall health of the U.S. scientific enterprise argues not only that **the pipeline isn't leaky**, but that it's the wrong metaphor. “**There is little evidence that science suffers a ‘leaky pipeline’** during the college years **that** disproportionately **steers students away from scientific fields** and toward non-scientific studies,” **write** Yu Xieof the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, **a sociologist and longtime analyst of the scientific workforce,** and Alexandra Killewald, his former doctoral student, who this month joined the faculty at Harvard University. Xie and Killewald argue that **the pipeline paradigm ignores two important variables: students who obtain an undergraduate science degree after switching from a nonscience field, and those who drop out of school before earning any degree. Those omissions**, the authors assert, **make the pipeline a fatally flawed description of a system** that **they believe is actually doing a pretty good job of meeting the country's need for scientific talent.** While that conclusion goes against the accepted wisdom, **experts find the** new **book persuasive**. “I think they have made a pretty good case [on both issues],” says sociologist Robert Hauser, head of the Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education at the National Research Council of the U.S. National Academies. In particular, he adds, “the pipeline is clearly a much more complicated story [than most people realize]. It doesn't look like there is a wholesale slaughter of kids hoping to become scientists.” **Xie and Killewald draw their conclusion from national longitudinal studies** **of** high school seniors and their **career aspirations**. In particular, the pair found that **the percent**age **of college graduates who earned a degree in** natural **sciences** or engineering **was higher than the percent**age of high school students **who said they hoped to earn such a degree**. In the most recent cohort—students who graduated from high school in 1992 with plans to attend college—the comparable figures for men are 28.3% and 27.5%; for women, it's 13.2% and 10.5%. The numbers are comparable for the 1972 and 1982 cohorts. (A study following students who graduated from high school in 2004 is still under way.) Those figures don't mean there is no attrition. Individual students do drop out of science, Killewald says, and moving into science at the graduate level is much more difficult, Xie adds. But at the undergraduate level, **those turning away from science are outnumbered by “switchers,” or those who enter from nonscience fields**. The phenomenon is especially noticeable among women who decide to go into the life sciences. In fact, Killewald says, the pipeline paradigm “captures less than 40% of the women who end up with science degrees.” **The other big flaw** in the pipeline paradigm, Xie and Killewald argue, **is its failure to distinguish between students who abandon science for other fields and those who simply drop out of university**. Among men in the 1992 cohort who fall short of their goal of earning a science degree, Killewald says, “70% receive no college degree at all, while only 30% receive a nonscience degree.” Aspiring **science** and engineering **majors actually have a lower dropout rate** than those planning to earn nonscience degrees—45% versus 51% for men, and 34% versus 40% for women. Those numbers, Killewald says, suggest that “the **leaks in the science pipeline are really leaks in the education pipeline**.” What she calls an “**unequal access to higher education,” a combination of economic, educational, and cultural factors that make it harder for students to attend and complete college**, also undermines attempts to attract more Latino and African-American students into science. The authors give a flat no to the book's title question, Is American Science in Decline? Stagnant salaries, gloomy job prospects for academics, and growing international competition are indeed cause for concern, they write. But **U.S. science is holding up surprisingly well**, they say, **and** **the country is more likely to benefit than be hurt by scientific advances elsewhere**.

#### Alt cause to STEM decline

#### Qualified teachers

Stephens 10

Senior Vice President, Human Resources and Administration at Boeing and Chair of the Aerospace Industries Association (Richard, Testimony to the House Science and Technology Committee, 2-4,

<http://www.aia-aerospace.org/assets/Stephens%20Written%20Testimony%202-4-2010(1).pdf)>

Our college and university system also prepares our teachers for primary and secondary ¶ education. But, by nearly every count, there are not enough qualified teachers to teach ¶ math and science in secondary schools. Many who teach STEM classes lack degrees in ¶ the fields they teach. According to the U.S. Department of Education, 58 percent of ¶ middle-school math teachers and 68 percent of middle-school science teachers are not ¶ proficient or certified in these subjects.

#### Junior high

Stephens 10

Senior Vice President, Human Resources and Administration at Boeing and Chair of the Aerospace Industries Association (Richard, Testimony to the House Science and Technology Committee, 2-4,

<http://www.aia-aerospace.org/assets/Stephens%20Written%20Testimony%202-4-2010(1).pdf)>

I know today’s hearing focuses primarily on the undergraduate and graduate levels of ¶ STEM education. But if we cannot get enough students interested in going into the ¶ undergraduate STEM curriculums, we will fail in meeting the needs of business, ¶ government, and our economy. The underlying cause of the STEM-worker shortage starts ¶ way before college. What you learn first sticks with you; that is certainly true for how ¶ you think of math, engineering and science—and whether you’re inclined to learn these ¶ subjects. Just as children whose parents read to them at a young age tend to do better as ¶ they progress through school and into adulthood, children whose imaginations are ¶ sparked by someone who reveals the possibilities of math or science tend to gravitate 6¶ toward STEM-related interests. How can we expect that to happen more when so many ¶ parents are intimidated by math and science? ¶ ¶ Unless and until we can show our young people that STEM specialties are important and ¶ fun—and pay well—the United States will continue to bleed human potential: ¶ • According to the Department of Education: Of nearly 4 million children who start ¶ pre-school in the United States each year, only about 25 percent of them go on to ¶ complete basic Algebra in junior high, only about 20 percent are still interested in ¶ STEM subjects by the 8¶ th¶ grade, only 16 percent are still interested in STEM ¶ subjects by the 12¶ th¶ grade, only 9 percent declare a STEM major at the ¶ undergraduate level, only 4.5 percent actually graduate with a STEM-related ¶ degree, and only 1.7 percent graduate with an engineering degree. These figures ¶ are disproportionately worse for minority and female students. And, by the way—¶ a topic for another day—1.2 million (or more than one-fourth) of those nearly 4 ¶ million children drop out of school altogether before they complete the 12¶ th¶ grade, ¶ though a majority of these eventually return to obtain diplomas or equivalents ¶ such as the GED. These trends are consistent year over year. [See Attachment A]

#### Lack of benefits for women

Goulden, 9

Ph.D., University of California researchers ¶ (Marc, et al, Ph.D., "Staying Competitive," November www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2009/11/pdf/women\_and\_sciences.pdf, accessed 10-8-12, mss)

Premier science largely depends on the quality of the pool of future scientists. For this reason the United States has made a major effort over the past 30 years to attract more outstanding U.S. students, particularly women, into research science. 1 **Women** have risen to the challenge with significant increases in all physical sciences and engineering, and they have made a huge advance in the life sciences, where they now **receive more than 50 percent of all Ph.D.s.** 2 **Women represent a large part of the talent pool** for research science, but many data sources indicate that **they are more likely than men to “leak” out of the pipeline** in the sciences before obtaining a tenured position at a college or university. 3 **The loss of** these **women,** together with serious increases in European and Asian nations’ capacity for research, **means the** long-term **dependability of a highly trained U.S. workforce and global preeminence in the sciences may be in question**. The Obama administration has made scientific research a major priority, with the 2009 stimulus package, or American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, including billions of dollars to the federal granting agencies, most prominently the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Energy. 5 This investment was made to create jobs, to maintain America’s scientific competiveness in the global market, and to balance a recent decline in real dollars provided by federal granting agencies to support basic and applied research at universities and colleges. 6 This initiative depends on an innovative, highly trained scientific workforce. A recent report by the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences confirmed that women who receive Ph.D.s in the sciences were less likely than men to seek academic research positions—the path to cutting-edge discovery—and they were more likely to drop out before attaining tenure if they did take on a faculty post. 7 However, the NRC report stated that their surveys did not shed light on many of the potential reasons why women were more likely to drop out: “The report does not explore the impact of children and family obligations (including elder care) on women’s willingness to pursue faculty positions in R1 institutions or the duration of postdoctoral positions.” 8 This report, based on extensive original research, addresses this impact and identifies both when and why **women and men with c**aregiving plans or **responsibilities drop** or opt **out** **of the** academic **science career path**. It provides an extensive examination of the experiences of researchers as well as the role that institutions of higher education and federal granting agencies play in regard to the leaky pipeline in the sciences. The report is based on data from a number of sources: A national longitudinal survey, the Survey of Doctorate Recipients; 9 surveys of four academic researcher populations in the University of California system, including doctoral students, postdoctoral scholars, academic researchers, and faculty; a survey of the 62 member institutions of the Association of American Universities, a nonprofit organization of leading public and private research universities in the United States and Canada; 10 and a survey of 10 of the major federal granting agencies. 11 Key findings This report makes an important contribution to understanding how family affects women’s ability to make it to the top of the scientific community. First, we examine the role of family formation (marriage and children) on leaks from the academic pipeline to tenure, the experiences of doctoral students and postdoctoral scholars in career path decision making, and the reputation of careers in academic settings. Next, we focus on family responsive benefits, such as paid maternity and parental leave, for researchers at major universities around the country, and the role of the federal granting agencies in regard to these issues. We then examine the structure of academia particularly in relation to time pressures, and finally make clear recommendations on further steps that research universities and federal agencies can take to fully address leaks in the academic pipeline. **Family formation**—most importantly marriage and childbirth—**accounts for the largest leaks in the pipeline** between Ph.D. receipt and the acquisition of tenure for women in the sciences. Our findings indicate that women in the sciences who are married with children are 35 percent less likely to enter a tenure track position after receiving a Ph.D. than married men with children (see Figure 1). And they are 27 percent less likely than their male counterparts to achieve tenure upon entering a tenure-track job. 12 By contrast, single women without young children are roughly as successful as married men with children in attaining a tenure-track job, and a little more successful than married women with children in achieving tenure. Married women without children also do not fare quite as well as men. Scientists often make decisions about their career path while still in training. In unparalleled surveys of doctoral students and postdoctoral scholars at the University of California, 13 we found that **both men and women report a shifting away** from the career goal of research professor, **with women’s move being more pronounced**. Among doctoral students, **career-life issues populate** four of the top-five **most commonly cited reasons why students changed their minds,** with women more likely than men to cite these issues as very important, and more than twice as likely as men to cite issues related to children. In contrast, for postdoctoral scholars career issues populated four of the top-five most commonly cited issues. “Issues related to children” was the only career-life issue in the top five and the only one that the majority of women who shifted their career goal away from research professor cited as very important. Women postdoctoral scholars who had a child while a postdoctoral scholar were twice as likely to change their career goal as men and twice as likely to do so as women with no children and no future plans to have them. **Research-intensive careers** in university settings **have a bad reputation** with both men and women. The majority of doctoral students and postdoctoral scholars indicated that they were concerned about the family friendliness of possible career paths, but research-intensive universities were considered the least family friendly of a range of possible career choices including tenure-track careers at teaching-intensive institutions, non-tenure track faculty positions, policy and managerial careers inside and outside academia, and research careers within and outside academia. Only 36 percent of postdoctoral women and 52 percent of postdoctoral men, and 28 percent of doctoral student women and 44 percent of doctoral student men viewed tenure-track careers at research-intensive institutions as family friendly. **America’s researchers receive limited benefits when it comes to** **family responsive policies** such as paid maternity and parental leave. Young scientists early in the pipeline are the least likely to have these benefits. Faculty are the only population where a majority of the 62 AAU universities (58 percent) 14 provide a baseline family-responsive maternity leave policy of at least six weeks of guaranteed paid leave following childbirth, without limitations that prohibit access to it (see Figure 2). **Only a fraction of research universities offer** this level of **paid maternity leave** to graduate students, postdoctoral scholars, and academic researchers, with only 13 percent of universities making this baseline policy available to graduate students (43 percent of them offer only ad hoc paid leave, or no paid leave at all). **The level of paid parental leave is even less encouraging**—only a tiny number of institutions provide a baseline of at least one week of guaranteed paid parental leave without limitations to any of the four populations. Many universities do provide some maternity and parental leave, but the limitations associated with these policies significantly affect contingent classes of researchers such as graduate students, postdoctoral scholars, and academic researchers. These limitations include requirements that limit the number of individuals who qualify for the policy, limitations on the length of the policy or the percentage of salary paid, and limitations focused on the accrual of sick and/or vacation leave.

#### No nuclear labor shortage – new agreement to use ex-Navy

World Nuclear News, 8-23-2012, “More options open for US workforce,” WNN, http://www.world-nuclear-news.org/NP-More\_options\_open\_for\_US\_workforce-2308127.html

Nuclear-trained ex-servicemen and women from the US Navy should be able to seamlessly transition to employment in the country's civil nuclear power industry under a groundbreaking agreement between the US Naval Propulsion Program and representatives of the nuclear industry. Randy Edington of Arizona Public Service Co, Steve Trautman of the US Navy Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program and Steve Kuczynski of Southern Nuclear Operating Co at the signing ceremony (Image: NEI) The agreement of understanding, announced by US industry organisation the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI), was signed on behalf of the Naval Propulsion Program by deputy director Steve Trautman. Some 31 nuclear industry representatives, including nuclear companies and the Institute of Nuclear Power Operators, have added their names to the list of signatories. The agreement forms the first ever formal partnership between the US Navy and the civilian industry aimed at helping nuclear-trained veterans to move into the domestic nuclear energy field, giving veterans the option of having their contact information forwarded directly to civil industry recruiters at the end of their service commitment. The agreement works in two directions: it also allows the US Navy to recruit directly from the 38 partner colleges in the Nuclear Uniform Curriculum Program (NUCUP), a partnership which aims to ensure a pipeline of nuclear industry talent trained to high, consistent standards. NUCUP was founded following efforts by the NEI to address anticipated skills shortage in a growing US nuclear energy industry. The US nuclear industry expects to hire some 25,000 more workers over the next five years, according to NEI senior vice president and chief nuclear officer Tony Pietrangelo. The new agreement "allows us to bring in experienced, highly skilled people who deserve rewarding civilian careers after selfless service to their country," he explained. "The beauty of this agreement is that it provides a multi-avenue flow for training the next generation of nuclear workers who can gain the skills and experience needed through formal education in or out of the military, on-the-job training or both that ensures a bright future in a growing industry," he said. Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program deputy director Steve Trautman noted that the new agreement would facilitate the navy's access to NUCUP graduates while allowing former sailors to use their skills after leaving the service. "Both of these are right for the Navy and the nation," he said.

#### Demonstration of fusion would spark pure fusion weaponization and arms racing

Makhijani 98 Arjun, Ph.D. and Pres. Inst. for Energy and Environmental Research, and Hisham Zerriffi, Project Scientist, 7-15, “Dangerous Thermonuclear Quest: The Potential of Explosive Fusion Research for the Development of Pure Fusion Weapons,” IEER, http://ieer.org/resource/reports/dangerous-thermonuclear-quest/

In the long term, facilities such as the National Ignition Facility and MTF facilities pose even greater threats to both the CTBT and the disarmament process. As discussed above, if ignition is demonstrated in the laboratory, the weapons labs and the DOE would likely exert considerable pressure to continue investigations and to engage in preliminary design activities for a new generation of nuclear weapons (even if it is just to keep the designers interested and occupied). Ignition would also boost political support and make large-scale funding of such activities more likely. Even without the construction of actual weapons, these activities could put the CTBT in serious jeopardy from forces both internal and external to the United States. Internally, those same pressures, which could lead to the resumption of testing of current generation weapons, could also lead to the testing of new weapons (to replace older, less safe or less reliable weapons). Externally, the knowledge that the United States or other weapons states were engaging in new fusion weapons design activities could lead other states to view this as a reversal of their treaty commitments. Comparable pressures to develop pure fusion weapons would be likely to mount in several countries. This would have severe negative repercussions for both non-proliferation and complete nuclear disarmament. The time to stop this dangerous thermonuclear quest for explosive ignition is now, before its scientific feasibility is established.

#### Nuclear war

Cohen and Douglass 2 Sam, nuclear weapons analyst and Joe, national security analyst, both members of the Los Alamos Tactical Nuclear Weapons panel, 3-11, “Nuclear Threat That Deesn’t Exist – Or Does It?” Rense, http://rense.com/general35/doex.htm

The comparison of a pure-fusion warhead with a normal fission warhead is even more stark. The lethal area to military troops of a 10 ton (high explosive equivalent yield) pure-fusion device would be approximately the same as the lethal area of a fission warhead several hundred times larger; that is, one in the kiloton range! The cost of a pure-fusion warhead is also reduced. In terms of the precious nuclear material that is required, namely, tritium and deuterium, pure-fusion devices are extremely cheap. Because the pure-fusion warhead does not need active nuclear material, such as plutonium, to "trigger" the deuterium-tritium burn, they can be made for a fraction of the cost of one fission-fusion neutron bomb of the 1980s. The inherent consequences of a pure-fusion device go far beyond low cost and greatly reduced explosive yield. Most significant, pure-fusion warheads, in contrast to warheads that use fissionable material, are not covered by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Any country can, in terms of international law, legally possess and even sell such weapons and not be in violation of the NPT. Also, deuterium-tritium fuel can be purchased openly on the international market. The spirit of the NPT may be in violation, but not the letter. Still further, because there is no fissionable component and because the explosive yield is so small, full operational tests of a pure-fusion device could be conducted in any country and not be detected by systems set up to monitor nuclear weapons tests. If tests were conducted underground at a moderate depth, say 50 to 100 meters, even the local inhabitants would suspect nothing. These consequences drive a stake through the heart of U.S. non-proliferation policies. These policies are based on preventing those who want to "go nuclear" from having access to the active nuclear material. A warhead or "device" that does not use active nuclear material (uranium or plutonium) is not prohibited. To make matters worse, in no sense can they be termed weapons of "mass destruction." Indeed, the pure-fusion devices are even more discriminant than the neutron bomb because there is, in comparison, negligible physical damage and a total absence of fission by-products and related contaminating fallout. Because of this, the pure-fusion device represents the worst fear of those whose personal crusade is to stop the spread of nuclear weapons and preserve the fire break in a hope that this will prevent a nuclear war. The pure-fusion device is less destructive than most conventional bombs, is reasonably cheap, and can be tested with impunity. It produces no fission radioactive by-products or fallout of serious concern. That is, the pure-fusion device renders the unthinkable thinkable. This is why officials do not want to discuss the possibility of pure-fusion warheads and, as will be seen, will do their best to deny their possible existence.

### Fusion

#### No chance of naval competitors – The US is far ahead and more capable now

The American Prospect 11,

[The False Decline of the U.S. Navy, <http://prospect.org/comment/11760>]

The United States Navy currently operates eleven aircraft carriers. The oldest and least capable is faster, one third larger, and carries three times the aircraft of Admiral Kuznetsov, the largest carrier in the Russian Navy. Unlike China’s only aircraft carrier, the former Russian Varyag, American carriers have engines and are capable of self-propulsion. The only carrier in Indian service is fifty years old and a quarter the size of its American counterparts. No navy besides the United States' has more than one aircraft carrier capable of flying modern fixed wing aircraft. The United States enjoys similar dominance in surface combat vessels and submarines, operating twenty-two cruisers, fifty destroyers, fifty-five nuclear attack submarines, and ten amphibious assault ships (vessels roughly equivalent to most foreign aircraft carriers). In every category the U.S. Navy combines presumptive numerical superiority with a significant ship-to-ship advantage over any foreign navy. This situation is unlikely to change anytime soon. The French Navy and the Royal Navy will each expand to two aircraft carriers over the next decade. The most ambitious plans ascribed to the People’s Liberation Army Navy call for no more than three aircraft carriers by 2020, and even that strains credulity, given China’s inexperience with carrier operations and the construction of large military vessels. While a crash construction program might conceivably give the Chinese the ability to achieve local dominance (at great cost and for a short time), the United States Navy will continue to dominate the world’s oceans and littorals for at least the next fifty years. In order to try to show that the U.S. Navy is insufficient in the face of future threats, Kaplan argues that we on are our way to “a 150 ship navy” that will be overwhelmed by the demands of warfighting and global economic maintenance. He suggests that the “1,000 Ship Navy” proposal, an international plan to streamline cooperation between the world’s navies on maritime maintenance issues such as piracy, interdiction of drug and human smuggling, and disaster relief, is an effort at “elegant decline,” and declares that the dominance of the United States Navy cannot be maintained through collaboration with others. It’s true that a 600 ship navy can do more than the current 250-plus ship force of the current U.S. Navy, but Kaplan’s playing a game of bait and switch. The Navy has fewer ships than it did two decades ago, but the ships it has are far more capable than those of the 1980s. Because of the collapse of its competitors, the Navy is relatively more capable of fighting and winning wars now than it was during the Reagan administration. Broadly speaking, navies have two missions; warfighting, and maritime maintenance. Kaplan wants to confuse the maritime maintenance mission (which can be done in collaboration with others) with the warfighting mission (which need not be). A navy can require the cooperation of others for the maintenance mission, while still possessing utter military superiority over any one navy or any plausible combination of navies on the high seas. Indeed, this is the situation that the United States Navy currently enjoys. It cannot be everywhere all at once, and does require the cooperation of regional navies for fighting piracy and smuggling. At the same time, the U.S. Navy can destroy any (and probably all, at the same time) naval challengers. To conflate these two missions is equal parts silly and dishonest. The Navy has arrived at an ideal compromise between the two, keeping its fighting supremacy while leading and facilitating cooperation around the world on maritime issues. This compromise has allowed the Navy to build positive relationships with the navies of the world, a fact that Kaplan ignores. While asserting the dangers posed by a variety of foreign navies, Kaplan makes a distortion depressingly common to those who warn of the decline of American hegemony; he forgets that the United States has allies. While Kaplan can plausibly argue that growth in Russian or Chinese naval strength threatens the United States, the same cannot reasonably be said of Japan, India, France, or the United Kingdom. With the exception of China and Russia, all of the most powerful navies in the world belong to American allies. United States cooperation with the navies of NATO, India, and Japan has tightened, rather than waned in the last ten years, and the United States also retains warm relations with third tier navies such as those of South Korea, Australia, and Malaysia. In any conceivable naval confrontation the United States will have friends, just as the Royal Navy had friends in 1914 and 1941. Robert Kaplan wants to warn the American people of the dangers of impending naval decline. Unfortunately, he’s almost entirely wrong on the facts. While the reach of the United States Navy may have declined in an absolute sense, its capacity to fight and win naval wars has, if anything, increased since the end of the Cold War. That the United States continues to embed itself in a deep set of cooperative arrangements with other naval powers only reinforces the dominance of the U.S. Navy on the high seas. Analysts who want to argue for greater U.S. military spending are best advised to concentrate on the fiascos in Iraq and Afghanistan.

#### Naval forces are resilient – US will continue to outpace competitors

**Gates 9**

US Secretary of Defense (Robert M., "A Balaced Strategy" Foreign Affairs January/February 2009, http://www.jmhinternational.com/news/news/selectednews/files/2009/01/20090201\_20090101\_ForeignAffairs\_ABalancedStrategy.pdf)

But it is also important to keep some perspective. As much as the U.S. Navy has shrunk since the end of the Cold War, for example, in terms of tonnage, its battle fleet is still larger than the next 13 navies combined -- and 11 of those 13 navies are U.S. allies or partners. Russian tanks and artillery may have crushed Georgia's tiny military. But before the United States begins rearming for another Cold War, it must remember that what is driving Russia is a desire to exorcise past humiliation and dominate its "near abroad" -- not an ideologically driven campaign to dominate the globe. As someone who used to prepare estimates of Soviet military strength for several presidents, I can say that Russia's conventional military, although vastly improved since its nadir in the late 1990s, remains a shadow of its Soviet predecessor. And adverse demographic trends in Russia will likely keep those conventional forces in check. All told, the 2008 National Defense Strategy concludes that although U.S. predominance in conventional warfare is not unchallenged, it is sustainable for the medium term given current trends. It is true that the United States would be hard-pressed to fight a major conventional ground war elsewhere on short notice, but as I have asked before, where on earth would we do that? U.S. air and sea forces have ample untapped striking power should the need arise to deter or punish aggression -- whether on the Korean Peninsula, in the Persian Gulf, or across the Taiwan Strait. So although current strategy knowingly assumes some additional risk in this area, that risk is a prudent and manageable one. Other nations may be unwilling to challenge the United States fighter to fighter, ship to ship, tank to tank. But they are developing the disruptive means to blunt the impact of U.S. power, narrow the United States' military options, and deny the U.S. military freedom of movement and action.

#### Even if they win a unique internal—takes 20 years and way more action than just spinoff research

CCAS 9,

Coalition for the Commercial Application of Superconductors, Superconductivity Present and Future Applications, <http://www.ccas-web.org/pdf/ccas_brochure_web.pdf>

Recent progress in superconductivity follows a pattern that marked previous developments in new materials - for example, in transistors, semiconductors and optical fibers. Materials-based technology development entails high risk and uncertainty compared to more incremental innovations. It typically takes 20 years to move new materials from the laboratory to the commercial arena. Yet products using new materials often yield the most dramatic benefits for society in the long run.¶ The long lead times inherent in HTS technology development necessitates a sustained government role, and government-industry partnerships play a pivotal role in this process. These partnerships require stable and consistent funding and a tolerance for risk. Careful planning is required to ensure parallel progress in related fields, such as cryogenics, to assure broad commercial acceptance of new LTS and of HTS technology. Prospective customers such as electric utilities require a stable and symmetrical climate for investment in research, development and demonstration projects.

#### Bilateral cooperation and strong Sino-Japanese relations solves for stability - mitigates risk of impact

ISDP, 08(Institute for Security and Defensive Policy, “Sino-Japanese Relations,” China Initiative, http://www.isdp.eu/programs-a-initiatives/china-initiative/sino-japanese-relations.html)

Throughout history, the relationship between China and Japan has more often than not been marked by mistrust and animosity, or even violent conflict. Despite three decades of normalized bilateral relations, several past and present issues serve to complicate the relation between the two states. Since a positive and functioning relationship between China and Japan, the two great powers in Northeast Asia, in many ways is a prerequisite for peace and stability in the region, a souring bilateral relationship is not only problematic for the states involved, but has implications for neighboring states and the international community at large. Against this background, it has become increasingly important to understand, identify and implement measures that can prevent and manage conflicts and disputes between these two states. This said, the Sino-Japanese relations have been on the mend since Shinzo Abe (安倍 晋三) assumed the Prime Minister's office in September 2006. His visit to China in October 2006 and the reciprocal visits of Chinese Prime Minister Wen Jiabao (温家宝) in April 2007 and President Hu Jintao in May 2008 facilitated the further thawing of bilateral relations under the framework of "mutually beneficial relationship based on common strategic relationship." A substantial number of additional events have indicated the continuation of the positive trend in the strengthening of the bilateral relations. As one example, in one attempt to initiate debate on the issue of historical perception on the 20th century Sino-Japanese relations, a joint committee of Chinese and Japanese historians was established in an effort to reach a certain understanding of each other´s perception of common history, mainly the atrocities from the Second World War. On the military side, the establishment of a hot-line in November 2007 and the port visits by the fleets represented important confidence building measures. Furthermore, China and Japan are in fact sustaining injured US dollar economy under current severe financial crisis. This may provide more opportunity for cooperation between the two countries. All of these bilateral efforts have been very positive.

### Energy Leadership

#### Natural gas solves US energy leadership

Jaffe 11 (Amy Myers Jaffe is director of the Baker Institute Energy Forum at Rice University and member of the Council on Foreign Relations, “The Americas, Not the Middle East, Will Be the World Capital of Energy”, October 2011, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/08/15/the_americas_not_the_middle_east_will_be_the_world_capital_of_energy?page=0,0>)

This hydrocarbon-driven reordering of geopolitics is already taking place. The petropower of Iran, Russia, and Venezuela has faltered on the back of plentiful American natural gas supply: A surplus of resources in the Americas is sending other foreign suppliers scrambling to line up buyers in Europe and Asia, making it more difficult for such exporters to assert themselves via heavy-handed energy "diplomacy." The U.S. energy industry may also be able to provide the technical assistance necessary for Europe and China to tap unconventional resources of their own, scuttling their need to kowtow to Moscow or the Persian Gulf. So watch this space: America may be back in the energy leadership saddle again.

#### Bureaucratic and institutional constraints thump preclude energy leadership

NEI ’12

["Improved Policies for Commercial Nuclear Trade Will Create American Jobs," June, <http://www.nei.org/resourcesandstats/documentlibrary/newplants/policybrief/improved-policies-for-commercial-nuclear-trade-will-create-american-jobs?page=1~~>]

**While U.S. firms offer some of the most innovative and safest nuclear energy technologies, they are hampered by cumbersome trade regulations, lack of coordination among the federal agencies involved, an inefficient export licensing process, limited options for financing nuclear exports and the absence of an international liability regime**. These companies face intense competition from suppliers in nations with less restrictive policies and substantial government subsidies for their nuclear industries. **To facilitate a greater U.S. role in the global commercial nuclear market, government support must be integrated into a seamless mechanism that includes coordination of nuclear trade policy, creation of bilateral agreements, export control reform and enhanced export financing. It also is vital that the United States pursue the international adoption of effective civil nuclear liability regimes**.

#### Can’t export tech

Platts 10-1

[Platts is a leading global provider of energy, petrochemicals and metals information, and a premier source of benchmark price assessments for those commodity markets, “Export reform needed to increase US nuclear market share: NEI,” <http://www.platts.com/RSSFeedDetailedNews/RSSFeed/ElectricPower/6666149>]

**Export controls on technology related to nuclear power should be reformed** to allow US companies to capture a larger share of growing international markets, the Nuclear Energy Institute said Monday. The US Department of Commerce estimates the world market for nuclear power technology, fuel and related services and equipment at "upwards of" $750 billion over the next 10 years, Richard Myers, vice president for policy development, planning and supplier programs at NEI, said at a press conference Monday in Washington to release a report the US nuclear power industry commissioned on the topic. "It is a myth that the US nuclear supply chain has disappeared," Myers said. Most manufacturing of large "heavy metal" components for nuclear power plants, such as reactor vessels, is now done in Asia, but many US firms manufacture "precision components" for the nuclear industry and would stand to benefit from increased ability to compete with other countries, Myers said. **US licensing and regulatory reviews of nuclear exports**, however, **are "unduly burdensome," have confusing "layers of jurisdiction" shared by at least four federal agencies, and typically take at least a year to complete, "months longer" than reviews in other exporter countries**, he said. As a result, **the US export control regime is "far more complex and more difficult to navigate ... than comparable regimes in other nations**," Myers said. The report prepared by the law firm Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman for NEI said that "US agencies should be able to increase the efficiency of their license processing through stronger executive branch procedures. By signaling to potential customers that US exports may be licensed on a schedule comparable to those of foreign export control regimes, such an improvement could significantly 'level the playing field' for US exporters in the near term." Many such reforms can be accomplished "administratively," without the need for legislation, James Glasgow, a partner at Pillsbury who specializes in nuclear export law, said during the press conference. The US Department of Energy is currently amending some of its export regulations, known as the Part 810 rule, and reforming that rule could provide significant opportunities to US exporters, Glasgow said. Unfortunately**, some of DOE's proposed revisions to the rule go in the wrong direction, adding regulatory requirements and hurdles**, Myers said. **Some potential customers for US nuclear exports see DOE's Part 810 review as "the choke point"**

**for an order, and "sometimes that's an evaluation criterion" for deciding whether to buy from a US firm**, Glasgow said. In such situations, delay in the review can be "the functional equivalence of denial" of permission for the export because the buyer looks elsewhere, he said.

## 2NC

### 2NC Overview

#### It’s the most likely impact

Kam 7

Ephraim Kam, Deputy Head-Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies, ‘7 (A Nuclear Iran, p. 50,

http://d.scribd.com/docs/2o4yoqqhx2btgchcpfug.pdf)<http://www.tau.ac.il/jcss/memoranda/memo88.pdf>

The statements by Iranian president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad about wiping Israel off the map are not qualitatively new and resemble those by other Iranian leaders. Their reiteration at a time when Iran is under pressure on the nuclear issue, however, suggests increasing extremism on the part of the Iranian leadership towards Israel, as well as diminished sensitivity towards international public opinion. Even if it is unlikely, the possibility that a fanatical group, whether within the regime or a faction emerging from a split in the leadership, will gain control of nuclear weapons and decide to use them against Israel cannot be categorically ruled out. Moreover, the Middle East is a volatile region that has witnessed much violence and military force. Ballistic missiles and chemical weapons have already been used on a large scale, including in wars between Muslim countries. The risk that nuclear weapons will be used in the Middle East is **greater than in other regions** and is **greater than the risk between the superpowers during the Cold War**. Rules of behavior and channels for dialogue capable of reducing the risk do not yet exist.

#### Sequestration is a bigger and faster internal link to every regional war and terror

Skelton 9/20

Partner with Husch Blackwell and former Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, 9/20/2012

(“Sequestration means cuts we can’t afford,” Roll Call, Lexis)

**Sequestration will** also **erode America's military superiority over the next decade by cutting even the most essential defense programs**. Any military commander will tell you that our ability to dominate the battlefield is not only dependent on critical thinking but is fueled by superior aircraft, ships, weapons and intelligence. Sequestration would cripple each of these categories, virtually interfere with professional military education at our war colleges, ending the modernization of fighter jets, combat ships, helicopters, ground vehicles, drone aircraft and satellite technologies.¶ Without a thorough study of the art of war and first-rate equipment, **the U.S. military will be far less able to deter gathering conflicts or quickly resolve those conflicts we are unable to avoid**. The "Powell Doctrine" of risking our troops only when backed up by overwhelming force and a clear path to decisive victory could be at risk.¶ With our unique portfolio of global responsibilities, **we could find it difficult to** simultaneously **pursue terrorists**, **contain Iran and North Korea**, **counter a rising China and deal with exploding hot spots such as Syria** today.¶ Those that say we can risk skipping one or two generations of military development are poor students of military history. America rose from a young, regional power to a formidable military force over the course of World War I alone. And Germany rose from the ashes of that war to threaten all of Europe in less than two decades.¶ Today, technology has accelerated the pace of change, and **our adversaries are** certainly **not sitting on their hands. Russia and China** are both building sixth-generation stealth fighters, while Iran and North Korea race to develop nuclear intercontinental ballistic missiles. **The rise of cyber weapons puts America's highly networked economy and society at particular risk**. We can choose to delay our defenses against these developing threats, but the threats themselves won't wait.¶

#### Sequestration turns the case---creates investor uncertainty that prevents commercialization/adoption of new energy

Malone 9/26

Scott is a Reuters writer. “Analysis: Corporate America sweats as U.S. nears fiscal cliff,” 2012, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/09/27/us-usa-economy-fiscalcliff-idUSBRE88P1PX20120927>

Top U.S. executives have less confidence in the business outlook now than at any time in the past three years - and a key reason is fear of gridlock in Washington over the fiscal deficit and tax policy. The uncertainty, coupled with slowing demand in Asia and Europe, is forcing corporate leaders to postpone decisions on major investments and hiring, and hurting sales of everything from textbooks to telephone lines. "If we don't deal with the fiscal cliff and don't deal with predictability on taxes for both citizens and business, with the rest of the world in a struggling state, this is really bad for us," John Chambers, CEO of network equipment maker Cisco Systems Inc (CSCO.O), told Reuters on Tuesday. Some 34 percent of U.S. CEOs plan to cut jobs in the United States over the next six months, up from 20 percent a quarter ago, according to a Business Roundtable survey released on Wednesday. Only 30 percent plan to raise capital spending, compared with 43 percent previously. The group's index of CEO confidence fell to its lowest point since the third quarter of 2009, when the United States had just emerged from its worst recession in 80 years. The main culprit is the fiscal cliff -- Washington's self-imposed year-end deadline to agree on a plan to shrink the federal budget or trigger $600 billion in spending cuts and higher taxes that were put in place last summer. The sharpest pain would be felt by the defense and healthcare sectors, which face direct funding cuts. But any resulting slowdown could send shockwaves across the economy.

#### That causes a depression

Morici 8/7

Peter, PhD, is a "recognized expert on economic policy and international economics." He is a Professor of International Business at the R.H. Smith School of Business at the University of Maryland. "Fix fiscal cliff now or face next Great Depression," 2012, <http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2012/08/07/fix-fiscal-cliff-now-or-face-next-great-depression/>

President Obama and Republicans are engaging in dangerous brinksmanship. Putting off a political solution to the looming “fiscal cliff” until after the election risks a second Great Depression.¶ Without a compromise by January, $400 billion in mandatory spending cuts and more than $100 billion in tax increases will immediately go into effect. With our economy only growing by only $300 billion annually, such a shock would thrust it into a prolonged contraction.

#### That turns the aff

**Carbon Control News 8**

(October 10th, 2008)

For instance, the nuclear industry's hope for renaissance in the face of looming greenhouse gas regulations could be one the first causalities of the economic crisis. The nation's first application for the construction of a new nuclear reactor in over three decades, submitted by Maryland-based Constellation Energy, has already been delayed in part due to the company's financial ties to the now-bankrupt Lehman Brothers investment firm

### 2NC UQ

#### Can’t wait till october

Washington Post 10-26

“Meet the Fiscal Cliff Divers, who Think Jumping Off the Cliff Could be Our Best Bet,” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/wp/2012/10/26/meet-the-fiscal-cliff-divers/>

Critics of the cliff-divers, however, ague they are being too sanguine about passing the Dec 31. deadline and doubt Congress would come together as quickly in early 2013 in such an environment of political brinksmanship. “It strikes me as a bit of a blase attitude—’We have an airbag, we’ll sprout wings,’” said Michael Hanson, chief US economist for Bank of America Merrill Lynch Global Research.¶ Hanson predicts it will actually take much longer than the cliff-divers imagine to come to a deal if we pass the deadline. And by that point, significant damage would be done to growth, the stock markets, and consumer and business confidence. “It definitely increases the chance of having one quarter if not two of negative growth,” he said.

### PC Framing

#### Framing issue --- political capital controls uniqueness

**Rowland 11/7**/12 Writer at the Boston Globe

(Christopher and Scott Helman, Economy kept Obama afloat, blocked Romney win, Boston Globe, <http://bostonglobe.com/news/nation/2012/11/07/economy-kept-obama-afloat-blocked-romney-win/GGjoaHhlk06KobPutBJoSP/story.html>)

Next up for Obama is proving to those voters that he can achieve results. That remains an exceedingly difficult task in a deeply divided capital, with Republicans retaining control of the House on Tuesday and Democrats staying in charge in the Senate. Latinos who voted for Obama in large numbers Tuesday will demand that he seriously pursue immigration reform. Hurricane Sandy’s devastating effects in New York and New Jersey have renewed calls to address climate change.¶ Most immediately, the president and Congress will have to deal with the looming “fiscal cliff’’ — a set of automatic budget cuts that were put in place by Washington leaders to extract themselves from the 2011 debt-ceiling standoff, combined with the expiration of the George W. Bush-era tax cuts.¶ Economists warn that the nation will slide into another recession if the president and Congress do not come up with a plan to avoid the sudden shock to the economy that would result. How these fiscal talks proceed will depend on how much political capital Obama is perceived to have gained in the election. He was narrowly winning the popular vote as the ballots were tallied into Wednesday. If Republicans see political danger in continuing to dig in their heels, will they be more willing to negotiate a tax overhaul that includes higher taxes for the wealthy?

#### He has enough now.

**Cohen 11/7**/12 Formerly the executive editor of The American Prospect, Cohn is currently a senior editor at The New Republic magazine

(Jonathan Cohn, Yes, Obama Won a Mandate, <http://www.tnr.com/blog/plank/109818/obama-wins-four-more-years-mandate-agenda-validation-obamacare>)

But what about the next four years? Doesn’t Obama still need a governing plan? Sure. And if Obama has been relatively silent lately on some urgent issues—chief among them, climate change—he’s been quite clear when it comes to economic policy. He’s produced plans for strengthening the recovery. He’s laid out principles for reducing the deficit: Relatively modest reductions in spending coupled with higher taxes on the wealthy. And with the coming debate over the spending sequester and expiration of the Bush tax cuts, both set for January 2013, Obama will get a chance to apply those principles.¶ The stakes in this fight are large: Depending on the terms, they will define the scope of the federal government for at least a generation to come. And, unlike in recent fiscal debates, **Obama should have leverage**—more, perhaps, than at any time since the earliest days of his presidency. He can hold out in the debate over the sequester and Bush tax cuts, because the default action—doing nothing—is far worse for Republicans than it is for him. And with the newly elected Tammy Baldwin and Elizabeth Warren joining the reelected Sherrod Brown and Sheldon Whitehouse in the Senate, Obama should have a more unified and incrementally more liberal congressional party behind him. (Hopefully they will push Obama, even as they get his back.)

### AT Thumpers

#### Fiscal cliff is before all that shit

**Klein 11-8** [Ezra Klein 11-8-2012 “Wonkbook: The election is over. Now the fiscal cliff begins.” New York Times http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/wp/2012/11/08/wonkbook-the-election-is-over-now-the-fiscal-cliff-begins/]

**25 problems for the second term: The postal service, the farm bill, cybersecurity, etc..**

**But the ‘fiscal cliff’ looks to be the first priority.** ”**The day after a hard-fought election** that left Barack Obama in the White House and control of Congress divided between the two parties, **the nation’s political leaders promised to try to avoid year-end spending cuts and tax increases** that threaten to push the U.S. back into recession…But the pressure is on. Deep, automatic federal-spending cuts and tax increases—a combination widely known as **the ‘fiscal clif’–will hit in January** unless Mr. Obama and Congress agree to some other way to reduce the budget deficit….Going over the cliff, economists say, would not only risk another recession, but would intensify anxiety about the dysfunction of the U.S. political system…**To tackle the fiscal cliff, Mr. Obama is expected to initiate a new round of talks with leaders of Congress. The goal would be a ‘grand bargain**’ combining higher taxes and money-saving changes to federal benefit programs.” Naftali Bendavid, Damian Paletta, and David Wessel in The Wall Street Journal.

**Negotiations are already happening.**

**Politico 11/8**/12 Washington Staff

(Behind Boehner's new tone, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1112/83608.html>)

Since Boehner gave the speech, Rep. Kevin McCarthy and his whip operation have called more than 120 House Republicans to gauge their reaction. By week’s end, they’ll have reached out to the entire House Republican Conference. When they return, McCarthy will meet with small groups of Republicans to feel them out for opposition.¶ At the staff level, the talks have **actually begun**. Boehner’s policy director, Brett Loper, has met informally with the Obama administration. Top aides to Boehner and Reid have also quietly huddled.¶ Inside Boehner’s operation, planning for these talks began in September on the second floor of the Capitol.¶ Boehner chief of staff Mike Sommers, Loper and Dave Schnittger — a Boehner hand from the Ohio Republican’s early days in D.C. — took to the famous “Board of Education” room to begin planning for two scenarios: a Romney win and an Obama victory.

#### Issues don’t cost capital until they are up

Drum ‘10

Kevin is a Columnist for Mother Jones, “Immigration Coming Off the Backburner,” <http://www.motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2010/03/immigration-coming-back-burner>

There's been plenty of overheated rhetoric and creative paranoia on display this year, but nativism has been, to me, the dog that didn't bark. The Tea Parties haven't been very focused on immigration, and while abortion and socialism both became major issues during health-care reform, fears that the bill would cover illegal immigrants (it won't, incidentally) never became a marquee issue.¶ Not to pick on Ezra or anything, but this attitude betrays a surprisingly common misconception about political issues in general. The fact is that political dogs never bark until an issue becomes an active one. Opposition to Social Security privatization was pretty mild until 2005, when George Bush turned it into an active issue. Opposition to healthcare reform was mild until 2009, when Barack Obama turned it into an active issue. Etc.¶ I only bring this up because we often take a look at polls and think they tell us what the public thinks about something. But for the most part, they don't.1 That is, they don't until the issue in question is squarely on the table and both sides have spent a couple of months filling the airwaves with their best agitprop. Polling data about gays in the military, for example, hasn't changed a lot over the past year or two, but once Congress takes up the issue in earnest and the Focus on the Family newsletters go out, the push polling starts, Rush Limbaugh picks it up, and Fox News creates an incendiary graphic to go with its saturation coverage — well, that's when the polling will tell you something. And it will probably tell you something different from what it tells you now.¶ Immigration was bubbling along as sort of a background issue during the Bush administration too until 2007, when he tried to move an actual bill. Then all hell broke loose. The same thing will happen this time, and without even a John McCain to act as a conservative point man for a moderate solution. The political environment is worse now than it was in 2007, and I'll be very surprised if it's possible to make any serious progress on immigration reform. "Love 'em or hate 'em," says Ezra, illegal immigrants "aren't at the forefront of people's minds." Maybe not. But they will be soon.¶ POSTSCRIPT: And keep in mind that one of the reasons the tea parties haven't (yet) taken up the immigration fight is very specific to the agenda of Dick Armey and FreedomWorks. I doubt that Armey will win this battle in the long run, though.¶ 1Granted, polls do give us a general idea of where we're starting from. If immigration reform were polling at 80%, for example, I'd feel pretty good about it since that number could deteriorate 20 points and it would still have a lot of support. But if it's polling at around 50-60% — which it is — that's dangerous territory. Once the yelling starts you can expect that number to go down a bunch, and suddenly it won't be a popular issue to tackle during an election year.

### AT No Deal

#### Fiscal cliff will pass but PC’s key

Kimberly Atkins 11-8, Boston Herald columnist, “Prez returns to D.C. with more clout,” 11/8/12, http://bostonherald.com/news/columnists/view/20221108prez\_returns\_to\_dc\_with\_more\_clout

When President Obama returned yesterday to the White House, he brought with him political capital earned in a tough re-election fight as well as a mandate from voters — which means bold changes and bruising fights could lie ahead. ¶ The first agenda item is already waiting for him: reaching an agreement with lawmakers to avert the looming fiscal cliff. GOP lawmakers have previously shot down any plan involving tax increases. Obama’s win — based in part on a message of making the wealthiest Americans pay more — may already be paying dividends.¶ In remarks at the Capitol yesterday, House Speaker John Boehner seemed to acknowledge the GOP has to take a different tack than the obstructionism that has marred progress in the past.¶ “The president has signaled a willingness to do tax reform with lower rates. Republicans have signaled a willingness to accept new revenue if it comes from growth and reform,” Boehner said. “Let’s start the discussion there.” ¶ Obama’s fresh political clout could extend to longer term fiscal policies beyond the fiscal cliff, though don’t expect GOP pushback to vanish. House Republicans still have plenty of fight in them. ¶ Comprehensive immigration reform — designed to smooth the path to citizenship while also strengthening the nation’s borders — also will be high on the president’s priority list. But unlike in his first term, when such a plan got little more than lip service in the face of staunch GOP opposition, Obama’s 3-to-1 support from Latinos on Election Day gives him the incentive to get it done. It also robs Republicans, who learned firsthand that dwindling support from Hispanics and other minority groups is costing them dearly, of any reason to stand in the way. ¶ An influx of new female voices in the Senate could also make Obama’s next four years the “Term of the Woman,” putting a new focus on equal pay and reproductive rights. ¶ U.S. Sen. Patty Murray of Washington state, who chairs the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, told reporters yesterday that having a historically high 20 women in the Senate in January won’t just mean more attention to women’s issues. She said the Senate will function better overall with “great women who have really strong voices” on board, such as U.S. Sen.-elect Elizabeth Warren. “There is no stronger advocate for middle-class Americans,” Murray said of Warren. ¶ None of this, of course, will be a cakewalk, but unlike his first term, Obama will have more power to push back.

#### GOP agrees

Montgomery and Goldfarb 11/6 Lori and Zachary are writer for the Washington Post. “Fresh from reelection, president finds himself on edge of ‘fiscal cliff’,” 2012, http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/decision2012/fiscal-cliff-clock-starts-in-earnest-as-election-fades-to-background/2012/11/06/c4dfde6e-27b2-11e2-b2a0-ae18d6159439\_story.html

President Obama returns to Washington from the campaign trail Wednesday to face an epic year-end battle over taxes and spending that could ultimately tame the national debt and advance his ambitions for a second term.¶ The president, who won reelection late Tuesday, must now confront the “fiscal cliff,” nearly $500 billion in automatic tax hikes and spending cuts set to take effect in January that could throw the nation back into recession.¶ If Obama can engineer a compromise to avert the cliff with the freshly reelected Republican House, he could set the stage for progress on other second-term priorities, including immigration reform, climate change and investments in education and manufacturing. Such a compromise could also infuse fresh energy into an economic recovery that has suffered from uncertainty over the future of federal budget policies.¶ “Getting a deal on long-term fiscal soundness is paramount to move forward and to see the economy really keep improving,” said Bill Daley, Obama’s former chief of staff. It will also “give confidence that the political system can address a major issue.”¶ With Congress scheduled to return to Washington next week for a post-election legislative session**,** policymakers will have just 49 days to reach consensus. At stake is the fate of dozens of expiring tax breaks — including lower rates for all taxpayers adopted during the George W. Bush administration — and deep cuts to the Pentagon and other agency budgets.¶ Obama has threatened to veto legislation to avert the cliff that extends the Bush tax rates for the wealthy. After a campaign focused heavily on that pledge, Democrats say the president is prepared to draw a firm line in the sand, even if it means letting one of the largest tax hikes in U.S. history take effect on Jan. 1.¶ “Republicans face a choice, and the choice is theirs,” said Rep. Chris Van Hollen (Md.), the senior Democrat on the House Budget Committee. “If they want to drive off the fiscal cliff, that means they want to go into January demanding that people like Mitt Romney get a bonus tax break or nobody gets any tax relief.”¶ Despite the risks to the economy — and the potential disruption to the 2012 tax filing season — Democrats see a clear advantage to going over the cliff. In January, once the Bush tax cuts have expired, Democrats would be free to draft their own plan to cut taxes for the middle class, but not the wealthy, and dare Republicans to reject it.¶ “If you allow all the tax rates to revert, you’re talking about raising $5 trillion over 10 years,” Van Hollen said. “So Republicans will have to choose: Do they prefer $5 trillion in [new] revenue? Or something in the range of $2 trillion?” The latter revenue figure is the target amount set by the independent fiscal commission led by Democrat Erskine Bowles and former GOP senator Alan K. Simpson of Wyoming.¶ Obama’s most recent budget request called for more than $1.5 trillion in new revenue over the next decade, primarily by raising rates and limiting the value of deductions on annual income over $250,000. In the coming days, Democrats say, Obama is likely to launch a concerted public relations campaign in support of his budget plan, continuing his call for a “balanced approach” to debt reduction.¶ Republicans have long resisted any increase in taxes, and conservatives say they will not bend, even if it means letting tax rates rise across the board.¶ “It’s a difficult position to be in,” acknowledged Rep. Jim Jordan (R-Ohio), chairman of the conservative Republican Study Committee. “But just two years ago, the American people sent 65 new Republicans to the House of Representatives. And they said, ‘Don’t go there and compromise with Barack Obama. Go there and stop him.’ ”¶ House Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio) took a similar stand late Tuesday after voters returned a Republican majority in the House. By renewing the GOP majority, he said during an event in Washington, “the American people have . . . made clear that there is no mandate for raising tax rates.”¶ Still, faced with a determined Democratic president, many Republicans on Capitol Hill and elsewhere say the GOP will have few options but to compromise.¶ ¶ “I love what John Boehner is saying, but I have a hard time believing Republicans won’t cave,” said GOP tax lobbyist Kenneth J. Kies. To resist Obama, “you have to be prepared to shoot the hostages. You have to be prepared to let it all expire. And it takes a lot of courage to do that.”

### AT: Obama Won’t Push

#### Obama’s pushing cliff and he needs to arm twist Congress

Davis 11/7 Julie and Mike Dorning. “Obama Success on Fiscal Cliff May Hinge on Congress Ties,” 2012, http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-11-07/obama-success-on-fiscal-cliff-may-hinge-on-better-congress-ties

President Barack Obama, his re- election victory sealed, is reaching out to congressional leaders to revive bipartisan deficit-reduction negotiations whose failure was a defining disappointment of his first term.¶ His chances of success, say Republicans and Democrats, depend on Obama’s willingness in his second term to build a rapport he has lacked with lawmakers from both parties and take a stronger role than he has to date in steering negotiations on sweeping changes to entitlements, taxes and spending.¶ “He’s simply going to have to take a more active and forceful role,” said Democratic strategist Jim Manley, a former aide to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid of Nevada. “He never got involved in the nitty-gritty of the legislative process. In light of the hyper-partisanship that still surrounds Capitol Hill, he’s going to have to change, and he’s going to have to take more of a lead in breaking the logjam.”¶ There are already indications that Obama is ready to do so. The president, who said in his Nov. 6 victory speech that he was “looking forward to reaching out and working with leaders of both parties to meet the challenges we can only solve together,” spoke yesterday by telephone with the top congressional Democratic and Republican leaders of the House and Senate.

#### Obama would have to push the plan for it to pass

Izadi 8/29 Elahe is a writer at the National Journal. “Former Sen. Trent Lott, Ex-Rep. Jim Davis Bemoan Partisanship on Energy Issues,” 2012, http://www.nationaljournal.com/2012-election/former-members-bemoan-partisanship-on-energy-issues-20120829

In a climate where everything from transportation issues to the farm bill have gotten caught in political gridlock, it will take serious willingness to compromise to get formerly bipartisan energy issues moving from the current partisan standstill. ¶ “If we get the right political leadership and the willingness to put everything on the table, I don’t think this has to be a partisan issue,” former Rep. Jim Davis, D-Fla., said during a Republican National Convention event on Wednesday in Tampa hosted by National Journal and the American Petroleum Institute. ¶ Former Senate Republican Leader Trent Lott of Mississippi said that “Republicans who want to produce more of everything have to also be willing to give a little on the conservation side.” ¶ The event focused on the future of energy issues and how they are playing out in the presidential and congressional races. Four years ago, the major presidential candidates both agreed that climate change needed to be addressed. However, since then, the science behind global warming has come into question by more and more Republicans. ¶ But casting energy as a defense or jobs issue, in the current political climate, will allow debates between lawmakers to gain some steam, Lott and Davis agreed. ¶ The export of coal and natural gas, hydraulic fracturing, and how tax reform will affect the energy industries are all issues that will have to be dealt with by the next president and Congress. ¶ “The job of the next president is critical on energy and many of these issues, and the job is very simple**:** adult supervision of the Congress,” Davis said. ¶ To that, Lott acknowledged that “Congress is gridlocked because of who is there.… The middle is gone.”

### 2NC Link

#### Fusion’s unpopular

Broad, 9/29

(NYT Columnist, “So Far Unfruitful, Fusion Project Faces a Frugal Congress,” http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/30/science/fusion-project-faces-a-frugal-congress.html?\_r=2&pagewanted=all)

For more than 50 years, physicists have been eager to achieve controlled fusion, an elusive goal that could potentially offer a boundless and inexpensive source of energy. To do so, American scientists have built a giant laser, now the size of a football stadium, that takes target practice on specks of fuel smaller than peppercorns. The device has so far cost taxpayers more than $5 billion, making it one of the most expensive federally financed science projects ever. But so far, it has not worked. Unfortunately, the due date is Sunday, the last day of the fiscal year. And Congress, which would need to allocate more money to keep the project alive, is going to want some explanations. “We didn’t achieve the goal,” said Donald L. Cook, an official at the National Nuclear Security Administration who oversees the laser project. Rather than predicting when it might succeed, he added in an interview, “we’re going to settle into a serious investigation” of what caused the unforeseen snags. The failure could have broad repercussions not only for the big laser, which is based at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California, but also for federally financed science projects in general. On one hand, the laser’s defenders point out, hard science is by definition risky, and no serious progress is possible without occasional failures. On the other, federal science initiatives seldom disappoint on such a gargantuan scale, and the setback comes in an era of tough fiscal choices and skepticism about science among some lawmakers. The laser team will have to produce a report for Congress about what might have gone wrong and how to fix it if given more time.

#### Plan drains capital and causes an immediate fight

Szondy, ‘12

[David, freelance writer -- Gizmag, 2-16, “Feature: Small modular nuclear reactors - the future of energy?” http://www.gizmag.com/small-modular-nuclear-reactors/20860/]

The problem is that nuclear energy is the proverbial political hot potato - even in early days when the new energy source exploded onto the world scene. The tremendous amount of energy locked in the atom held the promise of a future like something out of a technological Arabian Nights. It would be a world where electricity was too cheap to meter, deserts would bloom, ships would circle the Earth on a lump of fuel the size of a baseball, planes would fly for months without landing, the sick would be healed and even cars would be atom powered. But though nuclear power did bring about incredible changes in our world, in its primary role, generating electricity for homes and industry, it ended up as less of a miracle and more of a very complicated way of boiling water.¶ Not only complicated, but expensive and potentially dangerous. Though hundreds of reactors were built all over the world and some countries, such as France, generate most of their electricity from it, nuclear power has faced continuing questions over cost, safety, waste disposal and proliferation. One hundred and four nuclear plants provide the United States with 20 percent of the nation's power, but a building permit hadn't been issued since 1978 with no new reactors coming on line since 1996 and after the uproar from the environmental movement after nuclear accidents at Three Mile Island, Chernobyl and Fukushima, it seemed unlikely that any more would ever be approved - until now. This fierce domestic opposition to nuclear power has caused many governments to take an almost schizophrenic stance regarding the atom.

#### None of their ev applies to the lame duck

Miniter 12

Richard Miniter, investigative journalist, NYTimes best selling author, 2012, Leading from Behind: The Reluctant President and the Advisors Who Decide for Him, google books p. 85-6

After the historic defeat, Axelrod went on to teach a course called Campaign Strategy at Northwestern University in the Chicago suburbs. The day after the election, many White House staffers described their mood as "depressed." The loss of the U.S. House of Representatives and only a skinny remaining majority in the U.S. Senate meant that passing new programs would be very difficult. Would the next two years be an endless and enervating siege? Obama seemed strangely upbeat, '[he day after the midterm elections, the president convened a meeting with his senior Staff, While they saw clouds, he saw the sun through them. Democrats still ran both houses of Congress until January 3.2011. when the new session convened. To the surprise of some starters present, he enumerated an ambitious list of measures that he would like to see made law in the next sixty days; "a tax deal, extending unemployment benefits, ratification of New START treaty reducing nuclear arms, repeal of the Pentagon's Don't Ask/ Don't Tell policy preventing gays and lesbians from openly serving in the military, passage of the DREAM Act (which would grant citizenship to undocumented young adults who met certain requirements), and a children's nutrition bill advocated by Michelle Obama."" The list was unrealistic. It would have been a demanding agenda for Congress to accomplish over two years. let alone two months. Besides, using a "lame duck" Congress to pass major legislation had enormous political risks. It would be seen as an end-run around voters who had just elected a new majority with a new agenda. When President Carter had used a "lame duck' Congress to pass major bills (including the costly "Superfund" program) following the November 1980 elections in which he lost his reelection bid and Republicans won control of the Senate for the first time since I95-\*. the public was outraged. The outrage would be much bigger this time: Since 1980. the Internet, talk radio, and the Fox News Channel had emerged as powerful forums for channeling outrage. liven if Congress could actually adopt these controversial measures in a few short months, the political price of such a strategy would he high. Still, Obama continued to back Axelrod's analysis, which held that "independent voters wanted a leader who would make all the squabbling schoolchildren in Washington do their assignments."12 Who would do the "assigning"? The voters or the White House? Neither Obama nor Axel-rod seemed to wonder. If the federal government would finally pass a liberal wish list. Axelrod and Obama contended, voters would be happy. It was an unusual view. Independent voters in swing districts had actually voted down candidates who had supported the president's policies in the 2010 elections. Even in safely Democratic districts, independent voters had reduced their support of liberal lawmakers compared with 2008, exit polls showed. Few staffers were persuaded ch.it the president was right, although none dared to contradict him during that meeting. Passing Obama’s priorities during the Thanksgiving and Christmas holiday season had yet another obstacle. A massive White House staff reorganization was in progress. Rahm Emmanuel had stepped down as chief of staff in October 2010 and many other staffers were returning to Chicago or to academia. Without staff, it would be harder to rally the already reluctant Congress to act. Still, Obama was keen to proceed as planned. He was finally going to lead, but the timing and strategy were ill-considered. "Obama didn't care about the criticism that he was too insular," a White House aide said. "He didn't give a shit.\* Obama's proposals were dutifully sent to Capitol 1 lill. but most were essentially dead on arrival. Congress was exhausted and didn't want to take any more political risks.

### AT Ev before 11

#### New nuclear production causes massive political backlash and saps capital – any evidence pre 2011 is irrelevant

Alex Trembath, Policy Fellow in AEL’s New Energy Leaders Project, 11 [“Nuclear Power and the Future of Post-Partisan Energy Policy,” Lead Energy, Feb 4, http://leadenergy.org/2011/02/the-nuclear-option-in-a-post-partisan-approach-on-energy/]

Nuclear power is unique among clean energy technologies in that Democrats tend to be more hesitant towards its production than Republicans. Indeed, it has a reputation for its appeal to conservatives -Senators Kerry, Graham and Lieberman included provisions for nuclear technology in their ultimately unsuccessful American Power Act (APA) with the ostensible goal of courting Republican support. The urgency with which Democrats feel we must spark an energy revolution may find a perfect partner with Republicans who support nuclear power. But is there anything more than speculative political evidence towards its bipartisan viability?¶ If there is one field of the energy sector for which certainty of political will and government policy is essential, it is nuclear power. High up front costs for the private industry, extreme regulatory oversight and public wariness necessitate a committed government partner for private firms investing in nuclear technology. In a new report on the potential for a “nuclear renaissance,” Third Way references the failed cap-and-trade bill, delaying tactics in the House vis-a-vis EPA regulations on CO₂, and the recent election results to emphasize the difficult current political environment for advancing new nuclear policy. The report, “The Future of Nuclear Energy,” makes the case for political certainty:¶ “It is difficult for energy producers and users to estimate the relative price for nuclear-generated energy compared to fossil fuel alternatives (e.g. natural gas)–an essential consideration in making the major capital investment decision necessary for new energy production that will be in place for decades.”¶ Are our politicians willing to match the level of certainty that the nuclear industry demands? Lacking a suitable price on carbon that may have been achieved by a cap-and-trade bill removes one primary policy instrument for making nuclear power more cost-competitive with fossil fuels. The impetus on Congress, therefore, will be to shift from demand-side “pull” energy policies (that increase demand for clean tech by raising the price of dirty energy) to supply-side “push” policies, or industrial and innovation policies. Fortunately, there are signals from political and thought leaders that a package of policies may emerge to incentivize alternative energy sources that include nuclear power.¶ One place to start is the recently deceased American Power Act, addressed above, authored originally by Senators Kerry, Graham and Lieberman. Before its final and disappointing incarnation, the bill included provisions to increase loan guarantees for nuclear power plant construction in addition to other tax incentives. Loan guarantees are probably the most important method of government involvement in new plant construction, given the high capital costs of development. One wonders what the fate of the bill, or a less ambitious set of its provisions, would have been had Republican Senator Graham not abdicated and removed any hope of Republican co-sponsorship.¶ But that was last year. The changing of the guard in Congress makes this a whole different game, and the once feasible support for nuclear technology on either side of the aisle must be reevaluated. A New York Times piece in the aftermath of the elections forecast a difficult road ahead for nuclear energy policy, but did note Republican support for programs like a waste disposal site and loan guarantees.¶ Republican support for nuclear energy has roots in the most significant recent energy legislation, the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which passed provisions for nuclear power with wide bipartisan support. Reaching out to Republicans on policies they have supported in the past should be a goal of Democrats who wish to form a foundational debate on moving the policy forward. There are also signals that key Republicans, notably Lindsey Graham and Richard Lugar, would throw their support behind a clean energy standard that includes nuclear and CCS.¶ Republicans in Congress will find intellectual support from a group that AEL’s Teryn Norris coined “innovation hawks,” among them Steven Hayward, David Brooks and George Will. Will has been particularly outspoken in support of nuclear energy, writing in 2010 that “it is a travesty that the nation that first harnessed nuclear energy has neglected it so long because fads about supposed ‘green energy’ and superstitions about nuclear power’s dangers.”¶ The extreme reluctance of Republicans to cooperate with Democrats over the last two years is only the first step, as any legislation will have to overcome Democrats’ traditional opposition to nuclear energy. However, here again there is reason for optimism. Barbara Boxer and John Kerry bucked their party’s long-time aversion to nuclear in a precursor bill to APA, and Kerry continued working on the issue during 2010. Jeff Bingaman, in a speech earlier this week, reversed his position on the issue by calling for the inclusion of nuclear energy provisions in a clean energy standard. The Huffington Post reports that “the White House reached out to his committee [Senate Energy] to help develop the clean energy plan through legislation.” This development in itself potentially mitigates two of the largest obstacle standing in the way of progress on comprehensive energy legislation: lack of a bill, and lack of high profile sponsors. Democrats can also direct Section 48C of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 towards nuclear technology, which provides a tax credit for companies that engage in clean tech manufacturing.¶ Democrats should not give up on their policy goals simply because they no longer enjoy broad majorities in both Houses, and Republicans should not spend all their time holding symbolic repeal votes on the Obama Administration’s accomplishments. The lame-duck votes in December on “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell,” the tax cut deal and START indicate that at least a few Republicans are willing to work together with Democrats in a divided Congress, and that is precisely what nuclear energy needs moving forward. It will require an aggressive push from the White House, and a concerted effort from both parties’ leadership, but the road for forging bipartisan legislation is not an impassable one.

### 2NC Trade-off Link

#### Crowded lame duck means trade off.

Inside U.S. Trade, "Vietnam PNTR could be delayed by Peru, Oman despite broad support" June 16, 2006 lexis

Business lobbyists reacted with alarm to Boehner's comments, because considering trade bills in a lame duck session creates additional uncertainties. Following the elections, members may not vote the way they would have previously, one source noted, and there also is a danger that the agenda in a lame duck session would become too crowded for consideration of trade bills.

#### Crowded lame duck items get pushed off the agenda.

The Times of India, Chidanand Rajghatta, "Senate takes up bill on Indo-US nuke deal" November 16, 2006 lexis

The timeline is so short and tight and the legislative agenda for the lame-duck session is so crowded that some Indian activists were fearful that the Nuke deal might again get pushed out of the calendar. But Frist's announcement set the fears to rest.

**AT Agencies No Link**

#### Obama is made of Velcro - everything from his administration sticks to him

Los Angeles Times 10

7-30-10, p. <http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730>

Reporting from Washington — If Ronald Reagan was the classic Teflon president, Barack **Obama is made of Velcro.**¶ Through two terms, Reagan eluded much of the responsibility for recession and foreign policy scandal. In less than two years, **Obama has become ensnared in blame.**¶ Hoping to better insulate Obama, **White House aides have sought to give other Cabinet officials a higher profile and additional public exposure**. They are also crafting new ways to explain the president's policies to a skeptical public.¶ But **Obama remains the colossus of his administration — to a point where trouble anywhere in the world is often his to solve.**¶ **The president is on the hook to repair the Gulf Coast oil spill disaster, stabilize Afghanistan, help fix Greece's ailing economy and do right by Shirley Sherrod, the Agriculture Department official fired as a result of a misleading fragment of videotape.**

#### Obama is responsible for agencies Ellis 94

ELLIS, PROF OF GOV @ BERKELEY, 1994 PRICHARD, “PRESIDENTIAL LIGHTENING ROD, PG 2]

This argument seems plausible enough. But so too does the opposite case, argued by Harold Laski in his class *The American Presidency,* published in the same year (1940) as Herring’s treatise, **An American president**. Laski maintains, **cannot deflect blame unto subordinates. A president’s position as head of the executive branch**, Laski insists, “**makes him a target to be attacked by ever person or interest at all critical of his purposes. He is, there in all cases, to be blamed**; and there is no one, in any real sense, who can help to bear the burden of the blame. In contrast to England, where we blame an anonymous entity “the Government” **if things go wrong**, in the United States **it is the president who is blamed**. A decision of the Supreme Court is regarded as adverse to his policy; a defeat in Congress is a blow to *his* presidency; the mid-term congressional elections protect *his* policy, good or ill. NO one thinks of them in terms of their effects upon his cabinet.

### A2: Winners Win

**No Reason plan is a win, their evidence indicates big items like Cap and Trade not something as small as energy policy.**

**Wins take too long**

**Grist**, 7-28, **10**, <http://www.grist.org/article/2010-07-28-lessons-from-senate-climate-fail/>

Perhaps the most fateful decision the Obama administration made early on was to move healthcare reform before energy and climate legislation. I'm sure this seemed like a good idea at the time. Healthcare reform was popular, was seen as an issue that the public cared about on a personal level, and was expected to unite Democrats from all regions. **White House officials and Congressional leaders reassured environmentalists with their theory that success breeds success.** A quick victory on healthcare reform would renew Obama's political capital, some of which had to be spent early on to push the economic stimulus bill through Congress with no Republican help. **Healthcare reform was eventually enacted, but only after an exhausting battle that eroded public support, drained political capital, and created the Tea Party movement**. Public support **for healthcare reform is slowly rebounding** as some of the early benefits kick in and people realize that the forecasted Armageddon is not happening. B**ut this is occurring too slowly to rebuild Obama's political capital in time to help push climate legislation** across the finish line.

#### Winners lose

Mann 93

(Thomas, Senior Fellow in Governance Studies at the Brookings Institution, Beyond Gridlock, ed. Sundquist, pp.19-20, available via Google books)

The bad news is that **once the president gets a vote he wants, the immediate instinct of most members is to case the next vote to show their independence from the administration.** This is especially true when you have asked them to vote for a big package, in which some provisions did not make sense for their districts but had to be swallowed as part of the overall package. Then **their answer is, “I need the next vote to show that I am independent of the White House.”**

### STEM

### 2NC STEM High

#### STEM workers high now

ESA 11

Economics and Statistics Administration (ESA) 7/14/2011 “New Commerce Department Report Shows Fast-Growing STEM Jobs Offer Higher Pay, Lower Unemployment,” <http://www.esa.doc.gov/news/2011/07/14/new-commerce-department-report-shows-fast-growing-stem-jobs-offer-higher-pay-lower-u>, ts)

WASHINGTON – The U.S. Department of Commerce’s Economics and Statistics Administration (ESA) today released a new report that profiles U.S. employment in the science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) fields. STEM: Good Jobs Now and for the Future offers an inside look at workers who are driving our nation’s innovation and competitiveness and helping America win the future with new ideas, new companies and new industries. In 2010, 7.6 million people or 5.5 percent of the labor force worked in STEM occupations. Key findings from the new report show that over the past 10 years, growth in STEM jobs was three times greater than that of non-STEM jobs, and STEM jobs are expected to continue to grow at a faster rate than other jobs in the coming decade. Meanwhile, STEM workers are also less likely to experience joblessness. “This report profiles the fast-growing, productive STEM workforce and illustrates how we can win the future by encouraging the pursuit of 21st century jobs in science, technology, engineering and mathematics,” U.S. Commerce Secretary Gary Locke said. “STEM jobs are essential to a competitive, innovative and technologically advanced U.S. economy.”

#### STEM workers at sufficient levels

Lowell 10

B. Lindsay Lowell, Institute for the Study of International Migration, American Behavioral Scientist “A Long View of America’s Immigration Policy and the Supply of Foreign-Born STEM Workers in the United States”, 53(7) 1029–1044, March 2010

We hear frequently from prestigious panels or futurists, of one stripe or another, expressions of deep concern over the putative U.S. “restriction” of the highly skilled immigrant, in particular of scientists and engineers (Lowell & Salzman, 2007). It is hard not to come away from these pronouncements with a misleading perception that our system has failed in the past and will continue to fail to supply an adequate number of immigrants to the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). But this is far from the facts of the matter as immigration has continued to supply a substantial number of workers to STEM jobs and, unless STEM employment begins to grow at rates greater than those of the past 7 years, immigrants will continue to be a major supplier of STEM jobs. Contrary to casual perceptions, it can be readily demonstrated that the United States has admitted substantial numbers of immigrants over the past several decades and that there has been significant growth in the numbers of scientists and engineers since the 1990s. The growth during the 1990s was clearly related to the booming economy led by information technology (Dumagan & Gill, 2002; Lowell, 2001). However, it was abetted by an immigration system that is significantly more open than sometimes presumed. For one, family-based visas are issued to many skilled migrants who are sponsored by their often equally skilled spouses (Jasso, Massey, Rosenzweig, & Smith, 2000; Kaushal & Fix, 2006). Also, the Immigration Act of 1990 increased the number of visas available for foreign-born employment-based visas and diversified and eased admission for temporary skilled workers. In fact, the number of both permanent and temporary workers has continued to grow since the 1990 act went into play. Analyses of the Immigration Act of 1990 find clear evidence that the expanded cap on the employment-based visas increased the permanent admission of skilled workers, as well as their contribution to the flow (Greenwood & Ziel, 1997; Polgreen & Simpson, 2006). In addition, and with little need to resort to sophisticated analysis, temporary work visas can be seen to have admitted a significantly increased number of highly skilled workers. So the 1990 act, arguably, had its intended effect even if that has fallen short of admitting the number of immigrants that some of today’s stakeholders would prefer.

#### More people than jobs

Lowell and Salzman 7

B. Lindsay Lowell, Director of Research, Institute for the Study of International Migration, Georgetown University and Hal Salzman, Professor of Public Policy at the Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and. Public Policy and Senior Faculty Fellow at Rutgers, “Into the Eye of the Storm: Assessing the Evidence on Science and Engineering Education, Quality, and Workforce Demand”, October 2007, <http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411562_Salzman_Science.pdf>

In short, the U.S has been graduating more S&E students than there have been S&E jobs; hence, there are 15.7 million workers who report at least one degree in an S&E field but 4.8 million workers in an S&E occupation. There is, rather obviously, high attrition from school to work, and it simply cannot be explained by underachieving S&E graduates failing to qualify for jobs. At the same time, many of the S&E graduates outside of a formal S&E job may benefit from their training, but the simple indicators used here suggest that such training is not central to their current employment. This evidence suggests that the school-to-work attrition is neither due to poor educational preparation or, more optimistically, to the failure of formal occupational classifications to capture the extent to which S&E training is used in the labor market. Something else appears to be going on.

### FUSION

### 2NC Far Ahead

#### Naval power inevitable

**Farley 7**

(Roberts, Assistant Professor @ the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce, "The False Decline of U.S. Navy," Oct 23, <http://prospect.org/cs/articles?article=the_false_decline_of_the_us_navy>,)

We live in strange times. While the United States is responsible for close to 50 percent of aggregate world military expenditure, and maintains close alliances with almost all of the other major military powers, a community of defense analysts continues to insist that we need to spend more. In the November issue of The Atlantic, Robert Kaplan asserts that United States hegemony is under the threat of “elegant decline,” and points to what conventional analysts might suggest is the most secure element of American power; the United States Navy. Despite the fact that the U.S. Navy remains several orders of magnitude more powerful than its nearest rival, Kaplan says that we must beware; if we allow the size of our Navy to further decline, we risk repeating the experience of the United Kingdom in the years before World War I. Unfortunately, since no actual evidence of U.S. naval decline exists, Kaplan is forced to rely on obfuscation, distortion, and tendentious historical analogies to make his case. The centerpiece of Kaplan’s argument is a comparison of the current U.S. Navy to the British Royal Navy at the end of the 19th century. The decline of the Royal Navy heralded the collapse of British hegemony, and the decline of the U.S. Navy threatens a similar fate for the United States. The only problem with this argument is that similarities between the 21st century United States and the 19th century United Kingdom are more imagined than real. It’s true that the relative strength of the Royal Navy declined at the end of the 19th century, but this was due entirely the rise of the United States and Germany. But the absolute strength of the Royal Navy increased in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, as the United Kingdom strove to maintain naval dominance over two countries that possessed larger economies and larger industrial bases than that of Great Britain. In other words, the position of the Royal Navy declined because the position of the United Kingdom declined; in spite of this decline, the Royal Navy continued to dominate the seas against all comers until 1941. Britain’s relative economic decline preceded its naval decline, although the efforts to keep up with Germany, the United States, and later Japan did serious damage to the British economy. The United States faces a situation which is in no way similar. Returning to the present, Kaplan takes note of the growth of several foreign navies, including the Indian, Chinese, and Japanese. He points out that the Japanese Navy has a large number of destroyers and a growing number of submarines. He warns that India “may soon have the world’s third largest navy” without giving any indication of why that matters. Most serious of all, he describes the threat of a growing Chinese Navy and claims that, just as the Battle of Wounded Knee opened a new age for American imperialism, the conquest of Taiwan could transform China into an expansionist, imperial power. The curious historical analogies aside, Kaplan is careful to make no direct comparisons between the growing navies of foreign countries and the actual strength of the United States Navy. There’s a good reason for this oversight; there is no comparison between the U.S. Navy and any navy afloat today. The United States Navy currently operates eleven aircraft carriers. The oldest and least capable is faster, one third larger, and carries three times the aircraft of Admiral Kuznetsov, the largest carrier in the Russian Navy. Unlike China’s only aircraft carrier, the former Russian Varyag, American carriers have engines and are capable of self-propulsion. The only carrier in Indian service is fifty years old and a quarter the size of its American counterparts. No navy besides the United States’ has more than one aircraft carrier capable of flying modern fixed wing aircraft. The United States enjoys similar dominance in surface combat vessels and submarines, operating twenty-two cruisers, fifty destroyers, fifty-five nuclear attack submarines, and ten amphibious assault ships (vessels roughly equivalent to most foreign aircraft carriers). In every category the U.S. Navy combines presumptive numerical superiority with a significant ship-to-ship advantage over any foreign navy. This situation is unlikely to change anytime soon. The French Navy and the Royal Navy will each expand to two aircraft carriers over the next decade. The most ambitious plans ascribed to the People’s Liberation Army Navy call for no more than three aircraft carriers by 2020, and even that strains credulity, given China’s inexperience with carrier operations and the construction of large military vessels. While a crash construction program might conceivably give the Chinese the ability to achieve local dominance (at great cost and for a short time), the United States Navy will continue to dominate the world’s oceans and littorals for at least the next fifty years. In order to try to show that the U.S. Navy is insufficient in the face of future threats, Kaplan argues that we on are our way to “a 150 ship navy” that will be overwhelmed by the demands of warfighting and global economic maintenance. He suggests that the “1,000 Ship Navy” proposal, an international plan to streamline cooperation between the world’s navies on maritime maintenance issues such as piracy, interdiction of drug and human smuggling, and disaster relief, is an effort at “elegant decline,” and declares that the dominance of the United States Navy cannot be maintained through collaboration with others. It’s true that a 600 ship navy can do more than the current 250-plus ship force of the current U.S. Navy, but Kaplan’s playing a game of bait and switch. The Navy has fewer ships than it did two decades ago, but the ships it has are far more capable than those of the 1980s. Because of the collapse of its competitors, the Navy is relatively more capable of fighting and winning wars now than it was during the Reagan administration. Broadly speaking, navies have two missions; warfighting, and maritime maintenance. Kaplan wants to confuse the maritime maintenance mission (which can be done in collaboration with others) with the warfighting mission (which need not be). A navy can require the cooperation of others for the maintenance mission, while still possessing utter military superiority over any one navy or any plausible combination of navies on the high seas. Indeed, this is the situation that the United States Navy currently enjoys. It cannot be everywhere all at once, and does require the cooperation of regional navies for fighting piracy and smuggling. At the same time, the U.S. Navy can destroy any (and probably all, at the same time) naval challengers. To conflate these two missions is equal parts silly and dishonest. The Navy has arrived at an ideal compromise between the two, keeping its fighting supremacy while leading and facilitating cooperation around the world on maritime issues. This compromise has allowed the Navy to build positive relationships with the navies of the world, a fact that Kaplan ignores. While asserting the dangers posed by a variety of foreign navies, Kaplan makes a distortion depressingly common to those who warn of the decline of American hegemony; he forgets that the United States has allies. While Kaplan can plausibly argue that growth in Russian or Chinese naval strength threatens the United States, the same cannot reasonably be said of Japan, India, France, or the United Kingdom. With the exception of China and Russia, all of the most powerful navies in the world belong to American allies. United States cooperation with the navies of NATO, India, and Japan has tightened, rather than waned in the last ten years, and the United States also retains warm relations with third tier navies such as those of South Korea, Australia, and Malaysia. In any conceivable naval confrontation the United States will have friends, just as the Royal Navy had friends in 1914 and 1941. Robert Kaplan wants to warn the American people of the dangers of impending naval decline. Unfortunately, he’s almost entirely wrong on the facts. While the reach of the United States Navy may have declined in an absolute sense, its capacity to fight and win naval wars has, if anything, increased since the end of the Cold War. That the United States continues to embed itself in a deep set of cooperative arrangements with other naval powers only reinforces the dominance of the U.S. Navy on the high seas. Analysts who want to argue for greater U.S. military spending are best advised to concentrate on the fiascos in Iraq and Afghanistan.

## 1NR

#### Energy security