# Topicality

### 2AC

#### 1. We meet- plan creates incentives and secures a market for nuclear energy

#### 2. We meet- paying them is the financial incentive

#### 3. Counter interpretation- financial incentives are disbursement of public funds or contingent commitments

Webb 93

(lecturer in the Faculty of Law at the University of Ottawa (Kernaghan, “Thumbs, Fingers, and Pushing on String: Legal Accountability in the Use of Federal Financial Incentives”, 31 Alta. L. Rev. 501 (1993) Hein Online)

In this paper, "financial incentives" are taken to mean disbursements 18 of public funds or contingent commitments to individuals and organizations, intended to encourage, support or induce certain behaviours in accordance with express public policy objectives. They take the form of grants, contributions, repayable contributions, loans, loan guarantees and insurance, subsidies, procurement contracts and tax expenditures.19 Needless to say, the ability of government to achieve desired behaviour may vary with the type of incentive in use: up-front disbursements of funds (such as with contributions and procurement contracts) may put government in a better position to dictate the terms upon which assistance is provided than contingent disbursements such as loan guarantees and insurance. In some cases, the incentive aspects of the funding come from the conditions attached to use of the monies.20 In others, the mere existence of a program providing financial assistance for a particular activity (eg. low interest loans for a nuclear power plant, or a pulp mill) may be taken as government approval of that activity, and in that sense, an incentive to encourage that type of activity has been created.21 Given the wide variety of incentive types, it will not be possible in a paper of this length to provide anything more than a cursory discussion of some of the main incentives used.22 And, needless to say, the comments made herein concerning accountability apply to differing degrees depending upon the type of incentive under consideration.¶ By limiting the definition of financial incentives to initiatives where *public funds are either disbursed or contingently committed*, a large number of regulatory programs with incentive *effects* which exist, but in which no money is forthcoming,23 are excluded from direct examination in this paper. Such programs might be referred to as *indirect* incentives. Through elimination of indirect incentives from the scope of discussion, thedefinition of the incentive instrument becomes both more manageable and more particular. Nevertheless, it is possible that much of the approach taken here may be usefully applied to these types of indirect incentives as well.24 Also excluded from discussion here are social assistance programs such as welfare and *ad hoc* industry bailout initiatives because such programs are not designed primarily to *encourage* behaviours in furtherance of specific public policy objectives. In effect, these programs are assistance, but they are not incentives.

#### Ground- it is grounded in the literature and is the only way to intrinsically keep military affs in the topic which are key to beat states counterplans, and it links much harder to disads

#### Predictability- our evidence has a definitive list and an intent to define, and is supported in the literature

#### Limits- only adds procurement affs to their list, but limits out all indirect incentive effects their allows

#### Education- key to talk about different actors use of energy and how energy’s connection to the military, and no aff makes sense where the government is the consumer

#### Reasonability key to prevent a race to the most limiting definition

# Case

### AT Backup Power

#### Generators are too short-term

Andres 11

Richard B. Andres, Energy Security Chair, Institute for National Strategic Studies Professor of National Security Strategy, National War College, National Defense University, October 4, 2011, "SECURE GRID ‘11", http://www.ndu.edu/inss/docuploaded/Secure%20Grid%20'11%20After-Action%20Report.pdf

The Military – According to USNORTHCOM, its bases at the installation level are not normally provided real time advance warning of an impending GMD. Certain missions directly impacted by space weather do currently receive forecasts and warnings. However, notice to installations to ensure readiness of the support infrastructure may be necessary as well. It is essential that bases hosting critical missions have sufficient electrical power to sustain independent continuous operations even if the surrounding commercial power grid is lost. Though many installations possess diesel‐powered electrical generators, they have limited diesel fuel storage. In the event of a widespread grid outage, fuel supplies could dwindle rapidly, thereby impacting the ability of installations to conduct primary missions.

### AT Alternative Fuel and Energy Efficiency

#### Alternative fuels and energy efficiency don’t solve grid insecurity

Andres and Breetz 11

(Richard B. Andres is Professor of ¶ national Security Strategy at the ¶ national War College and a Senior fellow and energy and environmental ¶ Security and Policy Chair in the Center ¶ for Strategic research, institute for national Strategic Studies, at the national Defense University. Hanna L. Breetz is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Political Science at the Massachusetts institute of technology, “Small Nuclear Reactors ¶ for Military Installations:¶ Capabilities, Costs, and ¶ Technological Implications” Institute for National Strategic Studies, <http://www.ndu.edu/press/lib/pdf/strforum/sf-262.pdf>, SEH)

In recent years, the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) has become increasingly interested in the potential of small (less than 300 megawatts ¶ electric [MWe]) nuclear reactors for military use.¶ 1¶ DOD’s attention to ¶ small reactors stems mainly from two critical vulnerabilities it has identified in ¶ its infrastructure and operations: the dependence of U.S. military bases on the ¶ fragile civilian electrical grid, and the challenge of safely and reliably supplying ¶ energy to troops in forward operating locations. DOD has responded to these ¶ challenges with an array of initiatives on energy efficiency and renewable and ¶ alternative fuels. Unfortunately, even with massive investment and ingenuity, ¶ these initiatives will be insufficient to solve DOD’s reliance on the civilian grid ¶ or its need for convoys in forward areas. The purpose of this paper is to explore ¶ the prospects for addressing these critical vulnerabilities through small-scale ¶ nuclear plants.

**Water wars**

**Your K doesn’t matter because water war is as real as it gets**

**Dinar 2**

SAIS Review 22.2 (2002) 229-253¶ Water, Security, Conflict, and Cooperation¶ Shlomi Dinar is a Ph.D. candidate at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies. He is concentrating in environment, negotiation, conflict, and cooperation. This paper is dedicated to the memory of Captain Jerome E. Levy. This paper benefited from the Anna Sobol Levy Fellowship, a fellowship supported by Captain Levy. The author would also like to thank Benjamin Miller, Emanuel Adler, and the editors of this journal for very constructive comments. This article was originally inspired from an essay that originally appeared in International Negotiation. Shlomi Dinar, "Negotiation and International Relations: A Framework for Hydropolitics," International Negotiation 5, no. 2 (2000).

**The dichotomy of conflict and cooperation** over water and its relationship to national and regional security **reflects the reality of hydropolitics**. While military clashes have been associated with water, the concept of security does not end with nor does it only imply armed conflict. Because the pursuit of peace, and thus conflict and cooperation, constitutes the flip side of security, **water is indeed relevant to the concept of security**. It is this phenomenon that traditionalists have cast off as irrelevant and other rejectionists of the environment-security link have ignored.¶ **Linking security with the environment does not increase the possibility that nations will engage in more armed action against other states** for the sake of natural resources such as water. Albeit minimal, **evidence already exists as to the military skirmishes** and military threats that have taken place **over water. Nations will engage in armed conflict** and political disputes **over water whether or not scholars acknowledge the link between the environment and security**. Similarly, the existence of more than 3,600 water treaties, the oldest dating to 805 AD, demonstrates a rich history of cooperation [End Page 239] over water regardless of scholarly debate on cooperation and the environment. **The debate** regarding the link between water, conflict, and cooperation **is thus futile and has become a scholarly debate marred by polemics and semantics.**¶ **Given its geographical attributes, freshwater truly straddles the notion of sovereignty that traditionalists cherish so deeply and the international or regional conception that environmental globalists hold true. The problems that arise from shared water resources are both national and regional in nature. Similarly, the solutions that are needed to solve such problems are both national and regional. Most importantly for the debate on the environment and security, however, the impediments to cooperation and the instigation of conflict over water are both national and international in their sources. States in particular regions will continue to see water as a national security concern. Even though a regional agreement may be the best solution to states' water problems, they will continue to couch their need to access sufficient and clean freshwater in security and nationalist terms.**

# CP

### 2AC

#### Resolved means to deliberate.

Merriam Webster 9 [http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/resolved]

# Main Entry: 1re·solve # Pronunciation: \ri-ˈzälv, -ˈzȯlv also -ˈzäv or -ˈzȯv\ # Function: verb # Inflected Form(s): resolved; re·solv·ing 1 : to become separated into component parts; also : to become reduced by dissolving or analysis 2 : to form a resolution : determine 3 : consult, deliberate

#### Should means achieving the objectives of a presumptively mandatory requirement.

GAO 8 [Government Accounting Office, Exposure Draft of Proposed Changes to the International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing, http://www.gao.gov/govaud/cl\_iia080331.pdf]

The second sentence of the “must” definition used in the exposure draft instructions is more aligned with the definition of “should” as used by other standards setters, including GAO. The definition of “should” as used by GAO, which is intended to be consistent with the definition used by the AICPA and the PCAOB, indicates a presumptively mandatory requirement and contains the following language: “…in rare circumstances, auditors and audit organizations may depart from a presumptively mandatory requirement provided they document their justification for the departure and how the alternative procedures performed in the circumstances were sufficient to achieve the objectives of the presumptively mandatory requirement.”  We suggest that the IIA move the second sentence of the “must” definition to the “should” definition. The definition of “must” needs to be clear that “must” indicates an unconditional requirement and that another procedure cannot substitute for a “must.” Also, we suggest adding language to the definition of “should” to indicate that substituting another procedure for a “should” requirement is allowed only if the auditors document their justification for the departure from the “should” and how the alternative procedures performed in the circumstances were sufficient to achieve the objectives of the “should” requirement. The IIA should review every “must” requirement in the Standards to determine whether there are acceptable alternatives to the procedure; if so, “should” is the appropriate word.

#### Condition CP Bad

1. Fairness- Steals 9 minutes of aff offense and forces us to debate against ourselves having to say plan hurts the environment
2. Ground- gives uniqueness to an large number of unpredictable disads and allows jacking of best 2AC arguments
3. Time skew- answering one hit wonder skews 2AC necessitating rejecting the team
4. Ignore their offense- Their counterplan interpretations are self serving and judge bias is too far on states counterplans- Literature exists tons of things tangential to the topic, PICs out of topic words justify the The PIC, and they could run it as a disad

#### Uncertain implementation.

Barlas 12

(Stephen, Columnist @ Financial Executive, 1/1, Lexis)

But it is **highly unlikely** that Obama's blueprint will lead to a firmer footing for U.S. energy security than past so-called blueprints from other presidents, or perhaps more importantly, whether a print is even necessary. Obama's policy is a loosely knit set of policies that focus on producing more oil at home and reducing dependence on foreign oil by developing cleaner alternative fuels and greater efficiency. The Obama plan is not the result of any particular deep thinking or strategy. The President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) called for the development of such a strategy in its November 2010 Report to the President on Accelerating the Pace of Change in Energy Technologies. Through an Integrated Federal Energy Policy. PCAST called for a Quadrennial Technology Review (QTR) as the first step in preparing a Quadrennial Energy Review. DOE completed the QTR in November 2011, six months after Obama published his blueprint. Steven E. Koonin, former undersecretary of Energy for Science, says QTR is limited in scope and all DOE felt it could get done given budget and time. "Technology development absent an understanding and shaping of policy and market context in which it gets deployed is not a productive exercise," he says. At this point **there is no indication that DOE will even undertake the much more important QER, much less complete it any time soon**. The larger reality is that **any energy** independence **plan proposed by any U.S, president**--whether **based on a QER** or not--**has as much a chance of coming to fruition as Washington's football Redskins have of getting into the Super Bowl.** But regardless of the rhetoric of president after president, maybe the U.S. doesn't even need an energy independence or energy security policy. Natural Gas Making Inroads The biggest energy input for industrial and commercial business users is natural gas. Natural gas prices are incredibly important, both because the fuel is used directly to run industrial processes, heat facilities and commercial buildings and make products such as fertilizers, pharmaceuticals, plastics and other advanced materials. Thanks to the shale revolution, EIA forecasts natural gas prices will stay low for the foreseeable future, rising to $4.66 m/BTU in 2015 and $5.05 m/BTU in 2020. That is good news for the owners of 15,000 to 17,000 industrial boilers in this country, most of which use natural gas (and many of those who still use coal are switching to natural gas). In addition, companies such as Dow Chemical Co. are restarting operations at facilities idled during the recession, Bayer AG is in talks with companies interested in building new ethane crackers at its two industrial parks in West Virginia and Chevron Phillips Chemical Co. and LyondellBasell Co., are considering expanding operations in the United States. Fracking has also had a much less remarked-upon effect on petroleum prices, which are important to businesses with transportation fleets. New oil sources are spurting from the Bakken (stretching from Canada to North Dakota and Montana) and Eagles Ford (South Texas) shale plays. U.S. oil prices have fallen from $133.88 a barrel of Texas intermediate crude in June 2008 to around $86.07. EIA predicts oil prices will rise to $94.58/bbl in 2015 and $108.10/bbl in 2020. Beyond the flood of natural gas washing over them, U.S. companies are also benefitting from three decades of investments--most of which were made without federal subsidies, or support--into facility energy efficiency. Ralph Cavanagh, co-director of the Energy Program at the Natural Resources Defense Council and a member of the Electricity Advisory Board at DOE, says the most important single solution for U.S. businesses worried about energy prices and access is aggressive energy efficiency. "Energy independence is the wrong issue," Cavanagh says. "It is reducing the cost of energy services and improving energy security. "U.S. business has done a tremendous job in energy efficiency over the past three decades," he adds. "It takes less than one-half of a unit of energy to create $1 of economic value than it did in 1973. Industry has done that by upgrading the efficiency of process equipment and upgrading lighting." Others may well argue that the U.S. needs, and has always needed, an energy policy, but one narrowly targeted. Kenneth B Medlock III, deputy director, Energy Forum at the James A Baker III Institute for Public Policy at Rice University, notes that DOE and the Gas Research Institute helped develop, with federal funding, the horizontal drilling (i.e. fracking) technology that Mitchell Energy and Development Corp. (now a part of Devon Energy Corp.) pioneered. "Government ought to be focused on research and development," Med-lock notes. He also is a supporter of loan guarantees to promote investment activity in frontier technologies, and argues that as long as there are more good bets than bad bets in that kind of portfolio, the funds committed in total are a good investment. But spectacular failures of energy companies such as Solyndra Corp., the Chapter 11 filing of Beacon Power Corp. and other less publicized busts **reduce, if not kill,** the prospect of any additional congressional funding for energy loan guarantees of any kind. **That is true even when legislation has bipartisan support**, which is the case for the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act of 2011 (S. 1000), which would, among other things, provide grants for a revolving loan program designed to develop energy-saving technologies for industrial and commercial use. The bill passed the Senate Energy Committee by a vote of 18-3 in July. However, the Congressional Budget Office has pegged the cost of the bill's provisions at $1.2 billion over five years. That is a serious barrier to passage. And in any case, even if it did pass, the bill would simply authorize funding. Congressional appropriations committees would have to approve the money as part of DOE's budget, **which would be highly unlikely**, Solyndra aside, since similar programs authorized by the 2005 and 2007 energy bills are still begging for appropriations. Besides impact on the federal deficit, politics, too, often impede progress on otherwise sensible policies. Politics apparently have clogged up the proposed Keystone XL oil pipeline extension from Canada. Environmentalists, a Democratic constituency, oppose the project, arguing it would create more greenhouse gas emissions than necessary and pose a potential drinking water danger for Nebraska residents because it passed over the Ogallala Aquifer. That view is shared by Nebraska's Republican Gov. Dave Heineman, whose views are opposite those of all the can presidential candidates, each of whom supported U.S. approval of Keystone XL. Labor unions, another key Democratic constituency, support the project that TransCanada, the project sponsor, says will bring more than 11 8,000 person-years of employment to workers in the states of Montana, South Dakota and Nebraska. If the Keystone debate features Democrats versus Democrats and Republicans versus Republicans, efforts to substitute domestic natural gas for foreign petroleum features business versus business.

#### Certainty is essential – only effective method of catalyzing investment

Trembath, 11

[2/4/11, [Nuclear Power and the Future of Post-Partisan Energy Policy](http://leadenergy.org/2011/02/the-nuclear-option-in-a-post-partisan-approach-on-energy/), Alex Trembath is a policy associate in the Energy and Climate Program at Breakthrough. He is the lead or co-author of several Breakthrough publications, including the 2012 report "Beyond Boom and Bust: Putting Clean Tech on a Path to Subsidy Independence" and "Where the Shale Gas Revolution Came From." Alex is a graduate of University of California at Berkeley, <http://leadenergy.org/2011/02/the-nuclear-option-in-a-post-partisan-approach-on-energy/>]

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 oversightand public wariness necessitate a committed government partner for private firms investing in nuclear technology**. In a new** [**report**](http://www.thirdway.org/publications/370) **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)–**anessential 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**](http://leadenergy.org/2010/09/supply-demand-energy-innovation/)**, 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**](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/05/12/american-power-act-photos_n_573643.html#s90041&title=undefined) **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**](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/17/business/energy-environment/17NUCLEAR.html) **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**](http://washingtonindependent.com/99171/graham-circulating-clean-energy-standard) **and** [**Richard Lugar**](http://www.plattsenergyweektv.com/story.aspx?storyid=132784&catid=293)**, 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,”**](http://leadenergy.org/2011/01/the-rise-of-innovation-hawks/) **among them Steven Hayward, David Brooks and George Will. Will has been** [**particularly outspoken**](http://www.newsweek.com/2010/04/08/this-nuclear-option-is-nuclear.html) **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**](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/02/01/sen-jeff-bingaman-backs-n_n_816864.html) **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**](http://leadenergy.org/2010/12/clean-energy-financing-first-steps-towards-post-partisan-effort/#more-3320) **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 agressive 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.** The politician with **perhaps** the **single** greatest leverage over the future of nuclear energy is **President** Obama**, and his rhetoric matches the challenge posed by our aging and poisonous energy infrastructure. “This is our generation’s Sputnik moment,” announced Obama recently. Echoing the calls of presidents past, the President used his** [**State of the Union**](http://www.slate.com/id/2281847/) **podium to signal a newly invigorated industrialism in the United States. He advocated broadly for renewed investment in infrastructure, education, and technological innovation. And he did so in a room with many more members of the opposition party than at any point during the first half of his term.** The eagerness of the President tocombine **left and right** agendas can **hopefully** match the hyper-partisan bitterness **that dominates our political culture,** and nuclear power maybe one sector of our economy to benefit from his political leadership**.**

# Sequester

### Won’t Pass

#### Sequester happens- GOP

Tomasky 2-5

Michael is a Columnist for Newsweek and the Daily Beast, “There Will be no Budget Deal,” <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/02/05/there-will-be-no-budget-deal.html>

We’re less than a month away now from the sequester, the beginning of the deep budget cuts that will kick in automatically if President Obama and Congress don’t come to a budget deal. I have a news flash for you: There is not going to be any deal in the next 25 days. And here’s another news flash: In the Republican tug-of-war between those who want to protect the Pentagon and those who want to cut spending and damn the consequences, it’s looking like the latter are winning. If they get their way, it’s also almost certain that the austerity the cuts induce will cost a lot of jobs and hurt the economy. So the only thing for Barack Obama to do now is start agitating to make sure the American public blames the right culpable party here.¶ President Barack Obama speaks in Las Vegas on January 29, 2013. (Jim Watson/AFP/Getty)¶ First, a little info on the cuts and their predicted impact. These across-the-board cuts to defense programs and domestic discretionary programs (not to Social Security and entitlements) would start to take effect March 1, which the parties agreed to in the fiscal cliff deal. Over the next seven months, this would mean $55 billion in defense cuts and $27 billion in domestic cuts. Those are pretty steep cuts.¶ That’s austerity. Austerity, in difficult economic times, which these still are, is never good. Anything that takes money out of the economy isn’t good. This is the great paradox of the Republican position that “we” have to learn to live within our means. There’s never been more insidious nonsense put about the land. The only thing severe cutbacks would do is put the recovery at risk.¶ A New York Times editorial Monday noted that at least a million jobs might be lost, according to a Congressional Budget Office report, if the sequester cuts go into effect. To give you a point of comparison, the economy created 2.2 million jobs last year. And it was a decent year, no better. Imagine subtracting a million to 1.4 million from whatever positive number we get this year. That’s a pretty devastating hit.¶ Right now, though, it sounds as if that’s where the GOP wants to take us. The bread crumbs are being dropped—senators and House members are allowing themselves to be quoted as saying that maybe this is just the medicine the country needs, even including the defense cuts.¶ This is an important change in momentum. Last year, Republicans generally sounded more alarmed about Pentagon cuts than about spending and the budget deficit. But now, that’s flipping. Oklahoma Sen. Tom Coburn said, “I think sequester is going to happen. I think the people want it to happen.” South Carolina GOP Congressman Mick Mulvaney said recently, “Gridlock is leading to spending reductions. If the government does nothing, spending goes down. We have to claim victory.”¶ There’s something quite amusing about this, as Forbes’s Loren Thompson wrote yesterday. In allowing these defense cuts to go through, Republicans would be harming their own constituents, because there are considerably more military bases and supply depots and the like in red states than in blue states. Thompson noted that there are two bases in Mulvaney’s district where thousands of employees could be furloughed or fired.¶ What’s going on here? Undoubtedly, they’re at the end of their rope. They came to Washington to cut spending. The sequester has been delayed twice. Enough already. This would be understandable if their positions weren’t so economically thick-headed. But it’s what they believe, or at least “believe.”¶ It’s hard to know what they really believe, and it’s the same old guessing game. One of two things is true. One, they so despise and distrust government spending that they really do believe no good can possibly come of it and so spending has to be sliced, and if tossing the Pentagon on the fire is the only way to get it started, well, so be it. Two, they know better, but they figure well, if the economy does tank because of our collective stupid action, Obama’s the president, he’ll get the blame.

### 2AC A2: Econ

#### Sequester maintains economic growth and defense sequester occured

Kudlow 1-30

Larry is an economist and CNBC Host, “Sequester will Grow Private Economy,” <http://www.cnbc.com/id/100421175/Kudlow_Sequester_Will_Grow_Private_Economy>

Wednesday's report of a 0.1 percent gross domestic product decline for the fourth quarter came as a surprise to most forecasters. But it actually masks considerable strength in the private economy.¶ Namely, housing investment in the fourth quarter jumped 15.3 percent annually, business equipment and software spiked 12.4 percent, and real private final sales rose 2.6 percent. All in, the domestic private sector of the economy increased 3.4 percent annually—a very respectable gain.¶ (Read More: The 'Best-Looking' GDP Drop You'll Ever See.)¶ And here's one for the record books: Working ahead of year-end tax hikes, individuals shifted so much money to the fourth quarter at the 35 percent top rate that personal income grew by 7.9 percent annually—a huge number. And there's more: In order to beat the tax man, dividend income rose 85.2 percent annually. You think tax incentives don't matter? Guess again.¶ (Read More: Federal Reserve to Continue Stimulus Amid Signs of Weak Economy)¶ Now, all this private-sector strength occurred despite the fact that government spending—namely military spending—dropped 6.6 percent. Inventories also lost ground and the trade deficit widened.¶ But here's a key point: Military spending has now fallen virtually to its lower sequester-spending-cut baseline. It did so in one quarter by about $40 billion. So the brunt of the impact over the coming years has already been felt. (Normally, as of recent years, military spending has been virtually flat.)¶ (Read More: Why Markets Aren't Worried About Bad GDP Report)¶ Play Video¶ Sticking With the Sequester?¶ Sen. John Thune, (R-SD), discusses whether the GOP will stick with the sequester, to force spending cuts. And John Hlinko, Left Action founder, and Steve Moore, Wall Street Journal, discuss.¶ Which leads me to another key point: Even with the fourth-quarter contraction, the latest GDP report shows that falling government spending can coexist with rising private economic activity.¶ This is an important point in terms of the upcoming spending sequester. Lower federal spending, limited government, and a smaller spending-to-GDP ratio will be good for growth. The military spending plunge will not likely be repeated. But by keeping resources in private hands, rather than transferring them to the inefficient government sector, the spending sequester is actually pro-growth.¶ Big-government Keynesians think big spending provides big growth. They are wrong. This has been a 2 percent recovery—the worst in modern times—dating back to 1947. So let's try something different. Let's shrink government. Let's let the private sector breathe and generate entrepreneurship and risk-taking.¶ Spending is the true tax measure of the economy, according to Milton Friedman, Friedrich Hayek, and others. Even a modest sequester spending cut of maybe $60 billion in 2013, and perhaps more than $1 trillion over ten years (most of which will come from a slower spending growth rate, not real reductions), will be the best thing to inspire business and market confidence as well as international credibility. And it maybe even shave a point or two off the spending share of GDP.¶ (Read More: Op-ed: Bring On the Sequester!) ¶ On March 1 the spending sequester is supposed to kick in by law. If Congress wants to help the U.S. economy, the best thing it can do right now is implement this sequester. Then it can round out an even larger growth package, including large- and small-business tax reform and adjustments to stop entitlements from going bankrupt.

### PC Not Key

**Political Capital Not Key and Winners Win**

Michael **Hirsh 2/7**, Chief correspondent for National Journal. He also contributes to 2012 Decoded. Hirsh previously served as the senior editor and national economics correspondent for Newsweek, based in its Washington bureau, http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207

On Tuesday, in his State of the Union address, President Obama will do what every president does this time of year. For about 60 minutes, he will lay out a sprawling and ambitious wish list highlighted by gun control and immigration reform, climate change and debt reduction. In response, **the pundits will** do what they always do this time of year: They will talk **about how unrealistic most of the proposals are, discussions often informed by** sagacious reckonings of **how much “political capital” Obama possesses to push his program through**. **Most of this talk will have no bearing on what actually happens over the next four years. Consider** this: **Three months ago**, just before the November election, **if someone had talked seriously about Obama having enough political capital to oversee passage of both immigration reform and gun-control legislation** at the beginning of his second term—even after winning the election by 4 percentage points and 5 million votes (the actual final tally)—**this person would have been called crazy** and stripped of his pundit’s license. (It doesn’t exist, but it ought to.) In his first term, in a starkly polarized country, the president had been so frustrated by GOP resistance that he finally issued a limited executive order last August permitting immigrants who entered the country illegally as children to work without fear of deportation for at least two years. Obama didn’t dare to even bring up gun control, a Democratic “third rail” that has cost the party elections and that actually might have been even less popular on the right than the president’s health care law. And yet, **for reasons that have very little to do with Obama’s personal prestige or popularity**—**variously put in terms of a “mandate” or “political capital**”—**chances are fair that both will now happen**. What changed? In the case of gun control, of course, it wasn’t the election. It was the horror of the 20 first-graders who were slaughtered in Newtown, Conn., in mid-December. The sickening reality of little girls and boys riddled with bullets from a high-capacity assault weapon seemed to precipitate a sudden tipping point in the national conscience. One thing changed after another. Wayne LaPierre of the National Rifle Association marginalized himself with poorly chosen comments soon after the massacre. The pro-gun lobby, once a phalanx of opposition, began to fissure into reasonables and crazies. Former Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, D-Ariz., who was shot in the head two years ago and is still struggling to speak and walk, started a PAC with her husband to appeal to the moderate middle of gun owners. Then she gave riveting and poignant testimony to the Senate, challenging lawmakers: “Be bold.” As a result, momentum has appeared to build around some kind of a plan to curtail sales of the most dangerous weapons and ammunition and the way people are permitted to buy them. It’s impossible to say now whether such a bill will pass and, if it does, whether it will make anything more than cosmetic changes to gun laws. But one thing is clear: **The political tectonics have shifted dramatically in very little time. Whole new possibilities exist now that didn’t a few weeks ago.** Meanwhile, **the Republican members of the Senate’s so-called Gang of Eight are pushing hard for a new spirit of compromise on immigration reform**, a sharp change after an election year in which the GOP standard-bearer declared he would make life so miserable for the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. that they would “self-deport.” But this turnaround has very little to do with Obama’s personal influence—his political mandate, as it were. It has almost entirely to do with just two numbers: 71 and 27. That’s 71 percent for Obama, 27 percent for Mitt Romney, the breakdown of the Hispanic vote in the 2012 presidential election. Obama drove home his advantage by giving a speech on immigration reform on Jan. 29 at a Hispanic-dominated high school in Nevada, a swing state he won by a surprising 8 percentage points in November. But the movement on immigration has mainly come out of the Republican Party’s recent introspection, and the realization by its more thoughtful members, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and Gov. Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, that without such a shift the party may be facing demographic death in a country where the 2010 census showed, for the first time, that white births have fallen into the minority**. It’s got nothing to do with Obama’s political capital** or, indeed, Obama at all. **The point is not that “political capital” is a meaningless term**. Often it is a synonym for “mandate” or “momentum” in the aftermath of a decisive election—and just about every politician ever elected has tried to claim more of a mandate than he actually has. Certainly, Obama can say that because he was elected and Romney wasn’t, he has a better claim on the country’s mood and direction. Many pundits still defend political capital as a useful metaphor at least. “It’s an unquantifiable but meaningful concept,” says Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute. “You can’t really look at a president and say he’s got 37 ounces of political capital. But the fact is, it’s a concept that matters, if you have popularity and some momentum on your side.” The real problem is that the idea of political capital—or mandates, or momentum—is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get it wrong. “Presidents usually over-estimate it,” says George Edwards, a presidential scholar at Texas A&M University. “The best kind of political capital—some sense of an electoral mandate to do something—is very rare. It almost never happens. In 1964, maybe. And to some degree in 1980.” For that reason**, political capital is a concept that misleads far more than it enlightens.** It is distortionary. It conveys the idea that we know more than we really do about the ever-elusive concept of political power, and it discounts the way unforeseen events can suddenly change everything. Instead, **it suggests,** erroneously, **that a political figure has a concrete amount of political capital to invest**, just as someone might have real investment capital—that a particular leader can bank his gains, and the size of his account determines what he can do at any given moment in history. Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits. Does he have a majority in both chambers of Congress and a cohesive coalition behind him? Obama has neither at present. And unless a surge in the economy—at the moment, still stuck—or some other great victory gives him more momentum, it is inevitable that the closer Obama gets to the 2014 election, the less he will be able to get done. Going into the midterms, Republicans will increasingly avoid any concessions that make him (and the Democrats) stronger. But **the abrupt emergence of** the **immigration and gun-control** issues **illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly**. Indeed, **the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try.** Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “**Winning wins.**” **In theory, and in practice,** depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, **even in a polarized time**, **he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks.** Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote. Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. **Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue;** there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, **if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors”** Ornstein says. “**If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”** ALL THE WAY WITH LBJ Sometimes, **a clever practitioner of power can get more done just because he’s aggressive** and knows the hallways of Congress well. Texas A&M’s Edwards is right to say that the outcome of the 1964 election, Lyndon Johnson’s landslide victory over Barry Goldwater, was one of the few that conveyed a mandate. But **one of the main reasons for that mandate** (in addition to Goldwater’s ineptitude as a candidate) **was** President **Johnson’s masterful use of power** leading up to that election, **and his ability to get far more done than anyone thought possible, given his limited political capital.** In the newest volume in his exhaustive study of LBJ, The Passage of Power, historian Robert Caro recalls Johnson getting cautionary advice after he assumed the presidency from the assassinated John F. Kennedy in late 1963. Don’t focus on a long-stalled civil-rights bill, advisers told him, because it might jeopardize Southern lawmakers’ support for a tax cut and appropriations bills the president needed. “One of the wise, practical people around the table [said that] the presidency has only a certain amount of coinage to expend, and you oughtn’t to expend it on this,” Caro writes. (Coinage, of course, was what political capital was called in those days.) Johnson replied, “Well, what the hell’s the presidency for?” **Johnson didn’t worry about coinage, and he got the Civil Rights Act enacted, along with much else**: Medicare, a tax cut, antipoverty programs. He appeared to understand not just the ways of Congress but also the way to maximize the momentum he possessed in the lingering mood of national grief and determination by picking the right issues, as Caro records. “Momentum is not a mysterious mistress,” LBJ said. “It is a controllable fact of political life.” Johnson had the skill and wherewithal to realize that, at that moment of history, he could have unlimited coinage if he handled the politics right. He did. (At least until Vietnam, that is.) And then there are the presidents who get the politics, and the issues, wrong. It was the last president before Obama who was just starting a second term, George W. Bush, who really revived the claim of political capital, which he was very fond of wielding. Then Bush promptly demonstrated that he didn’t fully understand the concept either. At his first news conference after his 2004 victory, a confident-sounding Bush declared, “I earned capital in the campaign, political capital, and now I intend to spend it. That’s my style.” The 43rd president threw all of his political capital at an overriding passion: the partial privatization of Social Security. He mounted a full-bore public-relations campaign that included town-hall meetings across the country. **Bush failed utterly**, of course. **But the problem was not that he didn’t have enough political capital.** Yes, he may have overestimated his standing. Bush’s margin over John Kerry was thin—helped along by a bumbling Kerry campaign that was almost the mirror image of Romney’s gaffe-filled failure this time—but that was not the real mistake. **The problem was that whatever credibility or stature Bush thought he had earned as a newly reelected president did nothing to make Social Security privatization a better idea in most people’s eyes**. Voters didn’t trust the plan, and four years later, at the end of Bush’s term, the stock-market collapse bore out the public’s skepticism. Privatization just didn’t have any momentum behind it, no matter who was pushing it or how much capital Bush spent to sell it. The mistake that Bush made with Social Security, says John Sides, an associate professor of political science at George Washington University and a well-followed political blogger, “was that just because he won an election, he thought he had a green light. But there was no sense of any kind of public urgency on Social Security reform. It’s like he went into the garage where various Republican policy ideas were hanging up and picked one. I don’t think Obama’s going to make that mistake.… Bush decided he wanted to push a rock up a hill. He didn’t understand how steep the hill was. I think Obama has more momentum on his side because of the Republican Party’s concerns about the Latino vote and the shooting at Newtown.” Obama may also get his way on the debt ceiling, not because of his reelection, Sides says, “but because Republicans are beginning to doubt whether taking a hard line on fiscal policy is a good idea,” as the party suffers in the polls. THE REAL LIMITS ON POWER **Presidents are limited in what they can do by time and attention span**, of course, just as much as they are by electoral balances in the House and Senate. **But this**, too, **has nothing to do with political capital.** **Another well-worn meme of recent years was that Obama used up too much political capital passing the health care law in his first term**. **But the real problem was that the plan was unpopular, the economy was bad**, and the president didn’t realize that the national mood (yes, again, the national mood) was at a tipping point against big-government intervention, with the tea-party revolt about to burst on the scene. For Americans in 2009 and 2010—haunted by too many rounds of layoffs, appalled by the Wall Street bailout, aghast at the amount of federal spending that never seemed to find its way into their pockets—government-imposed health care coverage was simply an intervention too far. So was the idea of another economic stimulus. Cue the tea party and what ensued: two titanic fights over the debt ceiling. Obama, like Bush, had settled on pushing an issue that was out of sync with the country’s mood. Unlike Bush, Obama did ultimately get his idea passed. But the bigger political problem with health care reform was that it distracted the government’s attention from other issues that people cared about more urgently, such as the need to jump-start the economy and financial reform. Various congressional staffers told me at the time that their bosses didn’t really have the time to understand how the Wall Street lobby was riddling the Dodd-Frank financial-reform legislation with loopholes. Health care was sucking all the oxygen out of the room, the aides said. Weighing the imponderables of momentum, the often-mystical calculations about when the historic moment is ripe for an issue, will never be a science. It is mainly intuition, and its best practitioners have a long history in American politics. This is a tale told well in Steven Spielberg’s hit movie Lincoln. Daniel Day-Lewis’s Abraham Lincoln attempts a lot of behind-the-scenes vote-buying to win passage of the 13th Amendment, banning slavery, along with eloquent attempts to move people’s hearts and minds. He appears to be using the political capital of his reelection and the turning of the tide in the Civil War. But it’s clear that a surge of conscience, a sense of the changing times, has as much to do with the final vote as all the backroom horse-trading. “The reason I think the idea of political capital is kind of distorting is that it implies you have chits you can give out to people. It really oversimplifies why you elect politicians, or why they can do what Lincoln did,” says Tommy Bruce, a former political consultant in Washington. Consider, as another example, the storied political career of President Franklin Roosevelt. Because the mood was ripe for dramatic change in the depths of the Great Depression, FDR was able to push an astonishing array of New Deal programs through a largely compliant Congress, assuming what some described as near-dictatorial powers. But in his second term, full of confidence because of a landslide victory in 1936 that brought in unprecedented Democratic majorities in the House and Senate, Roosevelt overreached with his infamous Court-packing proposal. All of a sudden, the political capital that experts thought was limitless disappeared. FDR’s plan to expand the Supreme Court by putting in his judicial allies abruptly created an unanticipated wall of opposition from newly reunited Republicans and conservative Southern Democrats. FDR thus inadvertently handed back to Congress, especially to the Senate, the power and influence he had seized in his first term. Sure, Roosevelt had loads of popularity and momentum in 1937. He seemed to have a bank vault full of political capital. But, once again, a president simply chose to take on the wrong issue at the wrong time; this time, instead of most of the political interests in the country aligning his way, they opposed him. Roosevelt didn’t fully recover until World War II, despite two more election victories. **In terms of Obama’s second-term agenda, what all these shifting tides of momentum and political calculation mean is this: Anything goes**. Obama has no more elections to win, and he needs to worry only about the support he will have in the House and Senate after 2014. **But if he picks issues that the country’s mood will support**—such as, perhaps, immigration reform and gun control—**there is no reason to think he can’t win far more victories than any of the careful calculators of political capital now believe is possible**, **including battles over tax reform and deficit reduction**. **Amid today’s atmosphere of Republican self-doubt, a new, more mature Obama seems to be emerging**, one who has his agenda clearly in mind and will ride the mood of the country more adroitly**. If he can get some early wins**—as he already has, apparently, on the fiscal cliff and the upper-income tax increase—**that will create momentum**, **and one win may well lead to others**. “Winning wins.” **Obama himself learned some hard lessons over the past four years about the falsity of the political-capital concept**. Despite his decisive victory over John McCain in 2008, he fumbled the selling of his $787 billion stimulus plan by portraying himself naively as a “post-partisan” president who somehow had been given the electoral mandate to be all things to all people. So Obama tried to sell his stimulus as a long-term restructuring plan that would “lay the groundwork for long-term economic growth.” The president thus fed GOP suspicions that he was just another big-government liberal. Had he understood better that the country was digging in against yet more government intervention and had sold the stimulus as what it mainly was—a giant shot of adrenalin to an economy with a stopped heart, a pure emergency measure—he might well have escaped the worst of the backlash. But by laying on ambitious programs, and following up quickly with his health care plan, he only sealed his reputation on the right as a closet socialist. After that, Obama’s public posturing provoked automatic opposition from the GOP, no matter what he said. **If the president put his personal imprimatur on any plan**—from deficit reduction, to health care, to immigration reform—**Republicans were virtually guaranteed to come out against it.** But this year, when he sought to exploit the chastened GOP’s newfound willingness to compromise on immigration, his approach was different. He seemed to understand that the Republicans needed to reclaim immigration reform as their own issue, and he was willing to let them have some credit. When he mounted his bully pulpit in Nevada, he delivered another new message as well: You Republicans don’t have to listen to what I say anymore. And don’t worry about who’s got the political capital. Just take a hard look at where I’m saying this: in a state you were supposed to have won but lost because of the rising Hispanic vote. Obama was cleverly pointing the GOP toward conclusions that he knows it is already reaching on its own: If you, the Republicans, want to have any kind of a future in a vastly changed electoral map, you have no choice but to move. It’s your choice. **The future is wide open**.

### Flooding the Zone Solves

#### Obama proposing multiple competing bills solves

Todd et al 2-5

Chuck is an NBC News’ Chief Political Correspondent, “Flooding the Zone,” <http://firstread.nbcnews.com/_news/2013/02/05/16852487-first-thoughts-flooding-the-zone>

\*\*\* Flooding the zone: Exactly one week away from President Obama’s State of the Union address, the White House has spent the early days of the second term flooding the zone with its legislative agenda. Last week, the president delivered his big immigration speech in Las Vegas. Yesterday, he spoke about gun violence in Minnesota. Today, he’s meeting at the White House with progressive, labor, and business leaders to discuss immigration reform and the budget situation. What’s going on here: The Obama White House wants to overload Washington’s political circuits in an effort to see what it can get through Congress -- without letting Congress define what issues get addressed. After all, Republicans want to solely talk about the budget before the March budget showdown (see yesterday’s multiple coordinated responses by House Republicans on the White House’s announcement it would be late with its budget). Yet by flooding the zone, Team Obama -- with the bully pulpit and the State of the Union at its disposal -- wants to widen the political dialogue beyond that one issue. This “flooding the zone” concept is how the Obama White House operated in the first six months of the first term, and it’s where he got most of his legislative achievements. When the White House got bogged down on ONE issue (health care, debt ceiling, etc), officials determined they lost some of their political capital.

### Econ Defense

**No recession impact**

Coleman ‘3

(Glenn, writer for Money Magazine, CNN, “Peter Lynch: Why he's buying now,” 1-24, http://money.cnn.com/2003/01/23/funds/lynch/)

Recessions are scary things, and the obvious worries about jobs and bonuses and bills and bankruptcies-- the background noise that keeps you awake at night, Lynch calls it--often mute an important fact: **The U.S. economy has seen 10 recessions since 1945, and it has emerged from nine of them stronger than before**. Of course, it's not a fact yet that we'll pull ourselves No. 10 in better shape.

#### Economic decline does not cause shooting wars

Miller 2k

(Morris, economist, adjunct professor in the University of Ottawa’s Faculty of Administration, consultant on international development issues, former Executive Director and Senior Economist at the World Bank, Winter, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Vol. 25, Iss. 4, “Poverty as a cause of wars?” p. Proquest)

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

# Digger

**Extinction O/W**

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

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

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

**Perm Solvency**

**Perm: do both.**

**Only by combining methods can we avoid fragmentation and facilitate real political change to prevent planetary extinction – even if the perm risks cooption the apocalyptic imagery of the aff is rejuvenating to ecocriticism**

JL **Schatz. 2012**. Professor of English and Feminist Evolutionary Studies & Director of Debate at Binghamton University. The Importance of Apocalypse: The Value of End-Of-The-World Politics While Advancing Ecocriticism. Journal of Ecocriticism: A New Journal of Nature, Society and Literature. 4(2)

There are three things ecocriticism must keep in mind to retain its effectiveness in the poststructuralist era. First and foremost ecocritics must not allow their infighting over tactics and academic maneuvers to become debilitating. Ecocritics have enough on their plate fighting dominant political institutions. To never directly take up arms against ecologically destructive practices will merely cede potential avenues of resistance while we fight amongst ourselves. We must take from those ecocritics we partially disagree with what we can and then operate from a different platform so as to always be spectral in our resistance. Adopting varied tactics enables an ecological coalition centered on the connectedness that arises from the belief that we all have a shared stake in the planet. Awakening to our collective stake in the environment can overcome the illusionary boundaries of the nation-­‐state, species, or even sentience. Every molecule of the Earth’s ecology is interconnected. When one part dies we all stand on the brink of extinction. For ecocriticism to embrace this interconnection it must not erect borders between different approaches so long as the foundation of the struggle is premised upon the commons of our universe. Unfortunately, “what characterizes much campus left discourse is a substitution of moral rhetoric about evil policies[, leaving] ... absent ... a sober reckoning with the preoccupations and opinions of the vast majority of Americans ... who do not believe that the discourse of ‘anti-­‐imperialism’ speaks to their lives” (Isaac). As a result, **there is a need for ecocritics to not just speak to the choir that mostly already agrees with them. They must also speak to the populations who don’t intuitively see the link between imperialism, technology, and capitalism with environmental destruction. Apocalyptic rhetoric can do precisely that because of its underlying tenant of self-­preservation.** The above point is absolutely crucial because **ecocriticism cannot be effective if its focus never goes beyond the individual alone. No single person is the entire ecology so no individual can save it. While each individual undoubtedly impacts the environment and can cause change, no large scale transformation can take place if we never inspire collective action.** In evolutionary terms, ideas, thoughts, and actions must be passed on in order to survive. For that to happen it takes a combined effort, even though it can start by a single mutation. Luke reminds us that the typical consumer does not control the critical aspects of his or her existence[.] ... The absurd claim that average consumers only need to shop, bicycle, or garden their way to an ecological future merely moves most of the responsibility and much of the blame away from the institutional centers of power whose decisions actually maintain the wasteful, careless ways of material exchange[. It also] ... ignores how corporate capital, big government, and professional experts pushed the practices of ... affluent society ... as a political strategy to sustain economic growth, forestall mass discontent, and empower scientific authority. People did choose to live this way, but their choices were made from a very narrow array of alternatives presented to them as rigidly structured, prepackaged menus of very limited options. (Luke, 1997: 127-­‐128) In turn, **ecocritics must not displace the blame away from current hegemonic structures by calling on individuals to act alone**. Instead **ecocriticism must articulate its arguments to influence change in both institutions of power and the very people whose mindsets make up the current collective**. Many environmental groups have been able to do precisely that. For instance, “NGOs and social movements active in global civil society have ... introduce[ed] ... dystopian scenarios ... as rhetorical devices that act as ‘wake-­up calls’... to jolt citizens out of their complacency and ... foster ... public deliberation about the potential cataclysms facing humankind” (Kurasawa 464). **Ecocritics must not cut down** such NGOs for adopting **end-­of-­the-­world tactics even though their rhetoric might get co-opted when specific policies get enacted**. Secondly, **ecocriticism must never forget that what they do is politics.** There are two implications to this. On the one hand **it means that activists who directly lobby the government should not denounce the academically-oriented ecocritic for struggling within the academy. On the other hand it means that those who denounce the managerial tendencies that come along with governmental policies shouldn’t condemn activists who operate within the system**. Instead of attacking one another, **ecocritics should understand opposing discourses and ontologies as part of a spectral strategy that works against the environmental imperialism of the status-quo. We should take each opportunity for its fullest even in the face of failure.** **Once we acknowledge the virtual inevitability of co-optation the emphasis should be on creating successive struggles from a variety of standpoints.** Captain Paul Watson, for instance, does not merely pack up his flagship the Steve Irwin and head home after the Japanese whaling season ends. He goes on to fight for seals, dolphins, and a number of other animals all the while participating within a larger discourse surrounding planetary ecology. Not all of Watson’s tactics have been successful. Neither has anyone else’s. However, that doesn’t mean we should give up. Quite the opposite. For example, just because revolutionaries like Che Guevara have been turned into trendy t-­‐shirts, fueling the industries of capitalism, doesn’t mean he shouldn’t have fought against imperialism in the first place. In the same way, just because environmental activists are inevitably going to fall victim to constructing an image of the planet on the brink of extinction, it doesn’t mean that we should discount their battles against such destruction. Their counter constructions enable a contestation over what it means to be human in relationship to the rest of the world. Absent these counter narratives only a singular construction of anthropocentric managerial domination would exist. A consequence to this second point is that **the willingness to continually deploy different tactics is more powerful for ecocriticism than coming up with the perfect strategy. That way even when we become co-opted in one place we are already struggling from somewhere else.** In turn, **ecocriticism should focus on the underlying motivations that compel others to act in order to determine which ecocritics to be allies with. Through this way human beings can repair the willed manipulation inherent in calculative thinking and realize a patient equanimity toward Life. It is only in the context of this reawakened sense of the unity of life that revolutionary action gains an authentic basis**. It is the engagement with “the Other” that shows the ELF actions are truly about defense of plant and animal life, and they demonstrate genuine liberation concerns that typically are trapped within Enframing. That is to say, ELF (and similar) actions, show themselves as part of a ... profound solidarity ... [that] serves as a general basis for a post-­‐Enframing, post-­‐capitalist order, an ecological, not a capitalist society. (Best and Nocella 83) This shift allows ecocriticism to formulate ever-­‐greater coalitions while at the same time preventing a descent into moral relativism. **We can still utilize political action by eco-activists** and NGOs such as PETA and Greenpeace **productively, even if they result in reformist managerialism**, so long as the sole focus doesn’t fall upon a singular tactic. **Only a profound orientation of solidarity will ever have the hopes of succeeding**. Everything we do is deeply political and we must understand that in acting or in thinking we necessarily impact the world. **Uniting behind images of planetary omnicide holds the potential to collectively bring us together by awakening humanity to its shared stake in the global environment**. Third, and most importantly, ecocritics must adopt tactics that can most effectively influence other people without proscribing end goals. By this I mean that ecocritics must use those tools that can appeal to the masses while simultaneously making their appeals in such a way as not to force a choice upon them. Apocalyptic imagery is ideal for this task. It appeals to notions of shared planetary concerns that serve as motivation for others to act, even without fully knowing how the apocalypse can truly be averted. **By creating a compelling urge to do something that arises out of the image of planetary annihilation ecocriticism can influence a variety of people to take up arms through a multitude of techniques**. Society as a whole will never mobilize to halt the very practices that threaten life without such compelling inspiration. When ecocriticism helps other people see how certain actions risk their very survival it will enable our planet to evolve differently**. So long as ecocriticism never gives up on the struggle, even if this different direction may bring new scenarios of apocalypse, humanity as a species can continually evolve its patterns and behaviors to advert extinction**. This is not to say we will live forever. Rather it is to say that **as a species we can continue to exist in harmony with the lives all around us and give our deaths meaning.** Ultimately**, it is through imagining the end of the world that we will be able to envision how to save it.**

**Tech Thought Inevitable**

**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**.

**Tech thought is inevitable**

**Kateb 97**
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But the question arises as to where a genuine principle of limitation on technological endeavor would come from. **It is scarcely conceivable that** Western **humanity**--and by now most of humanity, because of their pleasures and interests and their own passions and desires and motives--**would halt the technological project**. **Even if,** by some change of heart, Western **humanity could adopt an altered relation to reality** and human beings, **how could it be enforced and allowed to yield its effects? The technological project can be stopped only by some global catastrophe** that it had helped to cause or was powerless to avoid. **Heidegger's teasing invocation of the idea that a saving remedy grows with the worst danger is useless**. **In any case, no one would want the technological project halted**, if the only way was a global catastrophe. Perhaps **even** the **survivors would not want to block its reemergence**. As for our generation and the indefinite future, many of us are prepared to say that there are many things we wish that modern science did not know or is likely to find out and many things we wish that modern technology did not know how to do. When referring in 1955 to the new sciences of life, Heidegger says We do not stop to consider that an attack with technological means is being prepared upon the life and nature of man compared with which the explosion of the hydrogen bomb means little. For precisely if the hydrogen bombs do not explode and human life on earth is preserved, an uncanny change in the world moves upon us (1966, p. 52). The implication is that it is less bad for the human status or stature and for the human relation to reality that there be nuclear destruction than that (what we today call) genetic engineering should go from success to success. **To such lengths can a mind push itself when it marvels first at the passions, drives, and motives that are implicated in modern technology, and then marvels at the feats of technological prowess**. The sense of **wonder is entangled with** a feeling of **horror**. **We are past even the sublime**, as conceptualized under the influence of Milton's imagination of Satan and Hell. **It is plain that so much of the spirit of the West is invested in modern technology**. **We have referred to anger, alienation, resentment**. But that cannot be the whole story. **Other considerations** we can mention **include** the following: a **taste for virtuosity**, skill for its own sake, **an enlarged fascination with technique in itself, and**, along with these, **an aesthetic craving to make matter or nature beautiful** or more beautiful; and then, too, sheer exhilaration, a questing, adventurous spirit that is reckless, heedless of danger, finding in obstacles opportunities for self-overcoming, for daring, for the very sort of daring that Heidegger praises so eloquently when in 1935 he discusses the Greek world in An Introduction to Metaphysics (1961, esp. pp. 123-39). **All these considerations move away from anger, anxiety, resentment**, and so on. The truth of the matter, I think, is that the project of **modern technology**, just like that of modern science, **must attract a turbulence of response**. The very **passions** and drives and motives **that look almost villainous** or hypermasculine **simultaneously look like marks of the highest human aspiration**, or, at the least, are not to be cut loose from the highest human aspiration.