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#### 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

# New Affs

# Case

#### Fifth generation aircraft solves anti-access and no chance Russia and China strat will work

Wilson ‘11

(J.R. Wilson has been a full-time freelance writer, focusing primarily on aerospace, defense and high technology, since 1992, when he finished a four-year assignment as North American Group Editor for the UK-based Jane’s Information Group. A 1971 graduate of the University of Missouri School of Journalism, he spent eight years with United Press International before joining McDonnell Douglas Astronautics Co. as head of public relations for the space sector. A similar post with defense simulation contractor Cubic Corp. was followed by a brief stint as president and CEO of a small manufacturing firm in San Diego. “Anti-access Air Defenses¶ Tracking the development of anti-stealth countermeasures” April 19, 2011 <http://www.defensemedianetwork.com/stories/anti-access-air-defenses/>, TSW)

The F-35 has continued the move away from high-maintenance coatings, with a greater use of durable, low-maintenance structural materials. Even so, it reportedly has a larger radar cross-section than the F-22 – a metal golf ball rather than a marble. Unlike the Raptor, the F-35’s stealth is primarily directed at radars in front of it, especially X- and upper S-band systems used by fighters, SAMs, and tracking radars, and, to a lesser extent, L-band surveillance systems.¶ Stealth also has been incorporated into requirements for some next-generation unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), especially unmanned combat air vehicles (UCAVs), which some believe may make the F-35 one of America’s last manned fighter aircraft. In addition, non-U.S. efforts to build fifth-generation fighters – at present, only the F-22 and F-35 – include both materials and shaping for stealth.¶ But many experts say the Russian Sukhoi T-50 (and its proposed Indian derivative, the HAL-FGFA) and Chinese J-20 are at least a decade from initial – much less full – operating capability. Nor do those nations have the production infrastructure or available funding to build large numbers of what more likely will be classed as Gen-4.5 fighters, in the same class with the F-15E Strike Eagle, F/A-18F Super Hornet, Eurofighter Typhoon, Dassault Rafale, Saab JAS 39 Gripen NG, Sukhoi Su-30MKI, and Mikoyan MiG-35.¶ Outside the United States, the three-variant F-35 is likely to fill the fifth-generation and stealth requirements of most U.S. allies for the majority of this century, while potential adversaries are unlikely to have access to such aircraft. Perhaps in large part because of the difficulties in designing and building either a true fifth-generation or advanced stealth fighter, many nations are following China’s lead in putting more emphasis on anti-stealth, anti-access air defense technologies.¶ Indeed, the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) emphasized the need for the U.S. Navy (USN) and Air Force to confront anti-access capabilities being developed by China, Iran, and North Korea to counter the B-2, F-22, and F-35.¶ “Our deterrent remains grounded in land, air, and naval forces capable of fighting limited and large-scale conflicts in environments where anti-access weaponry and tactics are used, as well as forces prepared to respond to the full range of challenges posed by state and non-state groups,” Secretary of Defense Robert M. Gates wrote in the QDR Executive Summary.¶ “U.S. air forces will become more survivable as large numbers of fifth generation fighters join the force. Land-based [USAF] and carrier-based aircraft [USN/USMC] will need greater average range, flexibility and multi-mission versatility in order to deter and defeat adversaries that are fielding more potent anti-access capabilities.”¶ In a section on “Rebalancing the Force,” the QDR focused on the need to deter and defeat aggression in anti-access environments.

# CP

## Acquire is the Counterplan

#### We can be the counterplan

US Code 3 Legal Information Institute, “41 USC § 131 – Acquisition”, November 24, <http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/41/131?quicktabs_8=1#quicktabs-8>

In division B, the term “acquisition”—¶ (1) means the process of acquiring, with appropriated amounts, by contract for purchase or lease, property or services (including construction) that support the missions and goals of an executive agency, from the point at which the requirements of the executive agency are established in consultation with the chief acquisition officer of the executive agency; and¶ (2) includes—¶ (A) the process of acquiring property or services that are already in existence, or that must be created, developed, demonstrated, and evaluated;¶ (B) the description of requirements to satisfy agency needs;¶ (C) solicitation and selection of sources;¶ (D) award of contracts;¶ (E) contract performance;¶ (F) contract financing;¶ (G) management and measurement of contract performance through final delivery and payment; and¶ (H) technical and management functions directly related to the process of fulfilling agency requirements by contract.

## Not Competative

**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.

## Certainty Key

#### Certainty is key

**Silverstein, Energybiz Editor-in-Chief, 12**

(Ken, August 26, 2012, “Obama and Romney: Electrifying the Energy Debate”, http://www.energybiz.com/article/12/08/obama-and-romney-electrifying-energy-debate)

While the presidential candidates are playing politics, the utility world is demanding certainty. The paradox is that those political positions come in two-to-four increments but power companies are developing 30-year business strategies. ¶ It’s the nature of democracies -- that candidates solicit supporters, who are then positioned to influence ever-changing rules. Implicit in the crafting of the tax code is the favoring of one group over another. The fossil fuels are betting on one horse while the renewable fuels are praying for another. Power companies, however, should be immune from any interest group’s political potency and more attuned to electrifying communities so that they can prosper. ¶ “Let’s talk about what is good for the electric system,” says Hugo van Nispen, chief operating officer for Americas DNV Kema. “It is more responsible for economic growth than oil and gas,” or any other option, for that matter, he adds. ¶ How are those arguments playing out in the 2012 presidential race? Unfortunately, says van Nispen, the candidates have allied themselves with specific interests -- something that serves to trivialize the debate and the true concerns at hand. The fact is that each energy source has its place in the electricity eco-system and that playing them off against each other is not the way forward. ¶ Utility officials must know society’s expectation of them: emission reductions, reliability or costs, followed by 15-20 years of policy certainty and the appropriate flexibility to achieve such aims. Only then can the nation achieve a broader blend of fuel options, or an all-of-the-above energy strategy. The production tax credit given to wind, for example, has become a bargaining chip that results in an unhealthy stop-and-go economic system, says van Nispen. Instead of politicizing it, he says that government should create a path to commercialization that is paved with dedicated tax incentives. ¶ “There has not been a clear start and end to what those credits should be accomplishing,” he says. “It makes sense for us as a nation to pursue clean energy and to incent that with appropriate tax incentives. If utilities and their partners understand the goals and they are highlighted with clarity and time frames, the industry will get there.”

# Electricity Prices

### No Link

#### High Altitude Wind is cheaper than anything

Cahoon ’11

Troy is a Captain in the U.S. Airforce and has a Master’s of Science in Aeronautical Engineering from the Air Force Institute for Technology, “Airborne Wind Energy: Implementation and Design for the U.S. Air Force,” <http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a539255.pdf>

Despite the technical challenges faced by this type of AWE system, the researchers developing this technology estimate that it will still be profitable. It is predicted that the cost of the power produced will be about 2 cents per kWh (including land lease, maintenance, operations, and capital costs), which is cheaper than any other current source of power.10 Currently, one company is in the process of building a relatively large-scale prototype version of this rotor-type AWE system. Sky WindPower Corporation is building and plans to fly their demonstration rotorcraft, seen in Figure 10, at altitudes up to 4,600 m (15,000 ft).10,14

# Environmental Security

### Threats are Real

#### Threats are not socially constructed- decision makers use the most objective, rational, and accurate assessments possible- there are no bureaucratic or ideological motivations to invent threats.

Ravenal ‘9

[Earl C. Ravenal, distinguished senior fellow in foreign policy studies @ Cato, is professor emeritus of the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service. He is an expert on NATO, defense strategy, and the defense budget. He is the author of *Designing Defense for a New World Order.* What's Empire Got to Do with It? The Derivation of America's Foreign Policy.” *Critical Review: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Politics and Society* 21.1 (2009) 21-75]

Quite expectedly, the more doctrinaire of the non-interventionists take pains to deny any straightforward, and therefore legitimate, security motive in American foreign and military policy. In fact, this denial leads to a more sweeping rejection of any recognizably rational basis for American foreign policy, and, even, sometimes (among the more theoretical of the non-interventionists), a preference for non-rational accounts, or “models,” of virtually any nation’s foreign policy-making.4 One could call this tendency among anti-imperialists “motive displacement.” More specifically, in the cases under review here, one notes a receptivity to any reworking of history, and any current analysis of geopolitics, that denigrates “the threat”; and, along with this, a positing of “imperialism” (the almost self-referential and primitive impulse) as a sufficient explanation for the often strenuous and risky actions of great powers such as the United States. Thus, not only is “empire” taken to be a sufficient and, in some cases, a necessary condition in bringing about foreign “threats”; but, by minimizing the extent and seriousness of these threats, the anti-imperialists put themselves into the position of lacking a rational explanation for the derivation of the (pointless at best, counter-productive at worst) policies that they designate as imperialistic. A pungent example of this threat denigration and motive displacement is Eland’s account of American intervention in the Korean and Vietnam wars:

After North Korea invaded, the Truman administration intervened merely for the purpose of a demonstration to friends and foes alike. Likewise, according to eminent cold war historians, the United States did not inter- vene in Vietnam because it feared communism, which was fragmented, or the Soviet Union, which wanted détente with the West, or China, which was weak, but because it did not want to appear timid to the world. The behavior of the United States in both Korea and Vietnam is typical of imperial powers, which are always concerned about their reputation, pres- tige, and perceived resolve. (Eland 2004, 64)

Of course, the motive of “reputation,” to the extent that it exists in any particular instance, is a part of the complex of motives that characterize a great power that is drawn toward the role of hegemon (not the same thing as “empire”). Reputation is also a component of the power projec- tion that is designed to serve the interest of national security. Rummaging through the concomitants of “imperialism,” Eland (2004, 65) discovers the thesis of “threat inflation” (in this case, virtual threat invention): Obviously, much higher spending for the military, homeland security, and foreign aid are required for a policy of global intervention than for a policy of merely defending the republic. For example, after the cold war, the security bureaucracies began looking for new enemies to justify keeping defense and intelligence budgets high. Similarly, Eland (ibid., 183), in a section entitled “Imperial Wars Spike Corporate Welfare,” attributes a large portion of the U.S. defense budget—particularly the procurement of major weapons systems, such as “Virginia-class submarines . . . aircraft carriers . . . F-22 fighters . . . [and] Osprey tilt-rotor transport aircraft”—not to the systemically derived requirement for certain kinds of military capabilities, but, rather, to the imperatives of corporate pork. He opines that such weapons have no stra- tegic or operational justification; that “the American empire, militarily more dominant than any empire in world history, can fight brushfire wars against terrorists and their ‘rogue’ state sponsors without those gold- plated white elephants.”

The underlying notion of “the security bureaucracies . . . looking for new enemies” is a threadbare concept that has somehow taken hold across the political spectrum, from the radical left (viz. Michael Klare [1981], who refers to a “threat bank”), to the liberal center (viz. Robert H. Johnson [1997], who dismisses most alleged “threats” as “improbable dangers”), to libertarians (viz. Ted Galen Carpenter [1992], Vice President for Foreign and Defense Policy of the Cato Institute, who wrote a book entitled A Search for Enemies). What is missing from most analysts’ claims of “threat inflation,” however, is a convincing theory of why, say, the American government significantly (not merely in excusable rhetoric) might magnify and even invent threats (and, more seriously, act on such inflated threat estimates). In a few places, Eland (2004, 185) suggests that such behavior might stem from military or national security bureaucrats’ attempts to enhance their personal status and organizational budgets, or even from the influence and dominance of “the military-industrial complex”; viz.: “Maintaining the empire and retaliating for the blowback from that empire keeps what President Eisenhower called the military-industrial complex fat and happy.” Or, in the same section:

In the nation’s capital, vested interests, such as the law enforcement bureaucracies . . . routinely take advantage of “crises”to satisfy parochial desires. Similarly, many corporations use crises to get pet projects— a.k.a. pork—funded by the government. And national security crises, because of people’s fears, are especially ripe opportunities to grab largesse. (Ibid., 182)

Thus, “bureaucratic-politics” theory, which once made several reputa- tions (such as those of Richard Neustadt, Morton Halperin, and Graham Allison) in defense-intellectual circles, and spawned an entire sub-industry within the field of international relations,5 is put into the service of dismissing putative security threats as imaginary. So, too, can a surprisingly cognate theory, “public choice,”6 which can be considered the right-wing analog of the “bureaucratic-politics” model, and is a preferred interpretation of governmental decision- making among libertarian observers. As Eland (2004, 203) summarizes:

Public-choice theory argues [that] the government itself can develop sepa- rate interests from its citizens. The government reflects the interests of powerful pressure groups and the interests of the bureaucracies and the bureaucrats in them. Although this problem occurs in both foreign and domestic policy, it may be more severe in foreign policy because citizens pay less attention to policies that affect them less directly.

There is, in this statement of public-choice theory, a certain ambiguity, and a certain degree of contradiction: Bureaucrats are supposedly, at the same time, subservient to societal interest groups and autonomous from society in general.

This journal has pioneered the argument that state autonomy is a likely consequence of the public’s ignorance of most areas of state activity (e.g., Somin 1998; DeCanio 2000a, 2000b, 2006, 2007; Ravenal 2000a). But state autonomy does not necessarily mean that bureaucrats substitute their own interests for those of what could be called the “national society” that they ostensibly serve. I have argued (Ravenal 2000a) that, precisely because of the public-ignorance and elite-expertise factors, and especially because the opportunities—at least for bureaucrats (a few notable post-government lobbyist cases nonwithstanding)—for lucrative self-dealing are stringently fewer in the defense and diplomatic areas of government than they are in some of the contract-dispensing and more under-the-radar-screen agencies of government, the “public-choice” imputation of self-dealing, rather than working toward the national interest (which, however may not be synonymous with the interests, perceived or expressed, of citizens!) is less likely to hold. In short, state autonomy is likely to mean, in the derivation of foreign policy, that “state elites” are using rational judgment, in insulation from self-promoting interest groups—about what strategies, forces, and weapons are required for national defense.

Ironically, “public choice”—not even a species of economics, but rather a kind of political interpretation—is not even about “public” choice, since, like the bureaucratic-politics model, it repudiates the very notion that bureaucrats make truly “public” choices; rather, they are held, axiomatically, to exhibit “rent-seeking” behavior, wherein they abuse their public positions in order to amass private gains, or at least to build personal empires within their ostensibly official niches. Such sub- rational models actually explain very little of what they purport to observe. Of course, there is some truth in them, regarding the “behavior” of some people, at some times, in some circumstances, under some conditions of incentive and motivation. But the factors that they posit operate mostly as constraints on the otherwise rational optimization of objectives that, if for no other reason than the playing out of official roles, transcends merely personal or parochial imperatives.

My treatment of “role” differs from that of the bureaucratic-politics theorists, whose model of the derivation of foreign policy depends heavily, and acknowledgedly, on a narrow and specific identification of the role- playing of organizationally situated individuals in a partly conflictual “pulling and hauling” process that “results in” some policy outcome. Even here, bureaucratic-politics theorists Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow (1999, 311) allow that “some players are not able to articulate [sic] the governmental politics game because their conception of their job does not legitimate such activity.” This is a crucial admission, and one that points— empirically—to the need for a broader and generic treatment of role.

Roles (all theorists state) give rise to “expectations” of performance. My point is that virtually every governmental role, and especially national-security roles, and particularly the roles of the uniformed mili- tary, embody expectations of devotion to the “national interest”; rational- ity in the derivation of policy at every functional level; and objectivity in the treatment of parameters, especially external parameters such as “threats” and the power and capabilities of other nations.

Sub-rational models (such as “public choice”) fail to take into account even a partial dedication to the “national” interest (or even the possibility that the national interest may be honestly misconceived in more paro- chial terms). In contrast, an official’s role connects the individual to the (state-level) process, and moderates the (perhaps otherwise) self-seeking impulses of the individual. Role-derived behavior tends to be formalized and codified; relatively transparent and at least peer-reviewed, so as to be consistent with expectations; surviving the particular individual and trans- mitted to successors and ancillaries; measured against a standard and thus corrigible; defined in terms of the performed function and therefore derived from the state function; and uncorrrupt, because personal cheating and even egregious aggrandizement are conspicuously discouraged.

My own direct observation suggests that defense decision-makers attempt to “frame” the structure of the problems that they try to solve on the basis of the most accurate intelligence. They make it their business to know where the threats come from. Thus, threats are not “socially constructed” (even though, of course, some values are).

A major reason for the rationality, and the objectivity, of the process is that much security planning is done, not in vaguely undefined circum- stances that offer scope for idiosyncratic, subjective behavior, but rather in structured and reviewed organizational frameworks. Non-rationalities (which are bad for understanding and prediction) tend to get filtered out. People are fired for presenting skewed analysis and for making bad predictions. This is because something important is riding on the causal analysis and the contingent prediction. For these reasons, “public choice” does not have the “feel” of reality to many critics who have participated in the structure of defense decision-making. In that structure, obvious, and even not-so-obvious, “rent-seeking” would not only be shameful; it would present a severe risk of career termination. And, as mentioned, the defense bureaucracy is hardly a productive place for truly talented rent-seekers to operate, compared to opportunities for personal profit in the commercial world. A bureaucrat’s very self-placement in these reaches of government testi- fies either to a sincere commitment to the national interest or to a lack of sufficient imagination to exploit opportunities for personal profit.

### Rejection Fails

#### The alternative results in more securitization and intervention

Tara **McCormack, 2010**, is Lecturer in International Politics at the University of Leicester and has a PhD in International Relations from the University of Westminster. 2010, (Critique, Security and Power: The political limits to emancipatory approaches, page 127-129)

The following section will briefly raise some questions about the rejection of the old security framework as it has been taken up by the most powerful institutions and states. Here we can begin to see the political limits to critical and emancipatory frameworks. In an international system which is marked by great power inequalities between states, the rejection of the old narrow national interest-based security framework by major international institutions, and the adoption of ostensibly emancipatory policies and policy rhetoric, has the consequence of problematising weak or unstable states and allowing international institutions or major states a more interventionary role, yet without establishing mechanisms by which the citizens of states being intervened in might have any control over the agents or agencies of their emancipation. Whatever the problems associated with the pluralist security framework there were at least formal and clear demarcations. This has the consequence of entrenching international power inequalities and allowing for a shift towards a hierarchical international order in which the citizens in weak or unstable states may arguably have even less freedom or power than before. Radical critics of contemporary security policies, such as human security and humanitarian intervention, argue that we see an assertion of Western power and the creation of liberal subjectivities in the developing world. For example, see Mark Duffield’s important and insightful contribution to the ongoing debates about contemporary international security and development. Duffield attempts to provide a coherent empirical engagement with, and theoretical explanation of, these shifts. Whilst these shifts, away from a focus on state security, and the so-called merging of security and development are often portrayed as positive and progressive shifts that have come about because of the end of the Cold War, Duffield argues convincingly that these shifts are highly problematic and unprogressive. For example, the rejection of sovereignty as formal international equality and a presumption of nonintervention has eroded the division between the international and domestic spheres and led to an international environment in which Western NGOs and powerful states have a major role in the governance of third world states. Whilst for supporters of humanitarian intervention this is a good development, Duffield points out the depoliticising implications, drawing on examples in Mozambique and Afghanistan. Duffield also draws out the problems of the retreat from modernisation that is represented by sustainable development. The Western world has moved away from the development policies of the Cold War, which aimed to develop third world states industrially. Duffield describes this in terms of a new division of human life into uninsured and insured life. Whilst we in the West are ‘insured’ – that is we no longer have to be entirely self-reliant, we have welfare systems, a modern division of labour and so on – sustainable development aims to teach populations in poor states how to survive in the absence of any of this. Third world populations must be taught to be self-reliant, they will remain uninsured. Self-reliance of course means the condemnation of millions to a barbarous life of inhuman bare survival. Ironically, although sustainable development is celebrated by many on the left today, by leaving people to fend for themselves rather than developing a society wide system which can support people, sustainable development actually leads to a less human and humane system than that developed in modern capitalist states. Duffield also describes how many of these problematic shifts are embodied in the contemporary concept of human security. For Duffield, we can understand these shifts in terms of Foucauldian biopolitical framework, which can be understood as a regulatory power that seeks to support life through intervening in the biological, social and economic processes that constitute a human population (2007: 16). Sustainable development and human security are for Duffield technologies of security which aim to *create* self-managing and self-reliant subjectivities in the third world, which can then survive in a situation of serious underdevelopment (or being uninsured as Duffield terms it) without causing security problems for the developed world. For Duffield this is all driven by a neoliberal project which seeks to control and manage uninsured populations globally. Radical critic Costas Douzinas (2007) also criticises new forms of cosmopolitanism such as human rights and interventions for human rights as a triumph of American hegemony. Whilst we are in agreement with critics such as Douzinas and Duffield that these new security frameworks cannot be empowering, and ultimately lead to more power for powerful states, we need to understand why these frameworks have the effect that they do. We can understand that these frameworks have political limitations without having to look for a specific plan on the part of current powerful states. In new security frameworks such as human security we can see the political limits of the framework proposed by critical and emancipatory theoretical approaches.

### Scenario Building Good

#### Prefer specific scenarios – even if we invoke some security logic, the fact that others will securitize means that we have to make worst-case assessments to avoid escalation

Ole Waever, Senior Research Fellow – Copenhagen Peace Research Inst., 2K

(I. R. Theory & the Politics of European Integration, ed Kelstrup/Williams p. 282-285)

The other main possibility is to stress responsibility. Particularly in a field like security one has to make choices and deal with the challenges and risks that one confronts – and not shy away into long-range or principled transformations. The meta-political line risks (despite the theoretical commitment to the concrete other) implying that politics can be contained within large ‘systemic’ questions. In line with the classical revolutionary tradition, after the change (now no longer the revolution but the meta-physical transformation), there will be no more problems whereas in our situation (until the change) we should not deal with the ‘small questions’ of politics, only with the large one (cf. Rorty 1996). However, the ethical demand in post-structuralism (e.g. Derrida’s ‘justice’) is of a kind that can never be instantiated in any concrete political order – it is an experience of the undecidable that exceeds any concrete solution and re-inserts politics. Therefore, politics can never be reduced to meta-questions; there is no way to erase the small, particular, banal conflicts and controversies. In contrast to the quasi-institutionalist formula of radical democracy which one finds in the ‘opening’ oriented version of deconstruction, we could with Derrida stress the singularity of the event. To take a position, take part, and ‘produce events’ (Derrida 1994: 89) means to get involved in specific struggles. Politics takes place ‘in the singular event of engagement’ (Derrida 1996: 83). Derrida’s politics is focused on the calls that demand response/responsibility in words like justice, Europe and emancipation. Should we treat security in this manner? No, security is not that kind of call. ‘Security’ is not a way to open (or keep open) an ethical horizon. Security is a much more situational concept oriented to the handling of specifics. It belongs to the sphere of how to handle challenges – and avoid ‘the worst’ (Derrida 1991). Here enters again the possible pessimism hich for the security analyst might be occupational or structural. The infinitude of responsibility (Derrida 1996: 86) or the tragic nature of politics (Morgenthau 1946, Chapter 7) means that one can never feel reassured that by some ‘good deed’, ‘I have assumed my responsibilities’ (Derrida 1996: 86). If I conduct myself particularly well with regard to someone, I know that it is to the detriment of an other; of one nation to the detriment of another nation, of one family to the detriment of another family, of my friends to the detriment of other friends or non-friends, etc. This is the infinitude that inscribes itself within responsibility; otherwise there would be no ethical problems or decisions. (ibid.; and parallel argumentation in Morgenthau 1946; Chapters 6 and 7) Because of this there will remain conflicts and risks – and the question of how to handle them. Should developments be securitized (and if so, in what terms)? Often our reply will be to aim for de-securitization and then politics meet meta-politics; but occasionally the underlying pessimism regarding the prospects for orderliness and compatibility among human aspirations will point to scenarios sufficiently worrisome that responsibility will entail securitization in order to block the worst. As a security/securitization analyst, this means accepting the task of trying to manage and avoid spirals and accelerating security concerns, to try to assist in shaping the continent in a way that creates the least insecurity and violence – even if this occasionally means invoking/producing ‘structures’ or even using the dubious instrument of securitization. In the case of current European configuration, the above analysis suggests the use of securitization at the level of European scenarios with the aim of preempting and avoiding numerous instances of local securitization that could lead to security dilemmas and escalations, violence and mutual vilification.

#### Scenario planning is key to effective energy policy

Laurance R. Geri and David E. McNabb. 2011. teaches in the Masters Program in Public Administration (MPA) at Evergreen State. Energy Policy in the U.S.: Politics, Challenges, and Prospects for Change. p. 30

Energy planners were chastened by the failure to anticipate the oil embargo, and subsequent changes in the demand and supply of important energy sources. Eventually a new approach to energy planning was developed, termed integrated resource planning (IRP) that combined improved forecasting techniques, use of scenarios to clarify possible combinations of anticipated demand, and used a least-cost decision rule for selecting future sources. IRP also emphasizes alternatives to conventional generation, including demand-side management approaches and systematic improvements. The overall IRP approach was mandated for public utilities in the Energy Policy Act of 1992. Whether IRP has improved utility performance is an open question. The more difficult question of whether energy analysts have improved their capacity to forecast future energy needs and events is still under debate. Winebrake and Sakva (2006) concluded that U.S. Department of Energy forecasts had not improved over a twenty-year period. Smil (2008) is likely correct that a better strategy is to formulate scenarios of energy use and their implications for society as a whole. Those may be used as starting points for debate about the type of future we want, and how to enact and implement policies that help us create that future. Box 2.1 is one small contribution to an explanation of why a solution to our widely understood energy problem has yet to be presented, let alone adopted.

**Ecosecurity good/inevitable**

**Ecosecurity discourse key to solvency**

**Matthew 2**, Richard A, associate professor of international relations and environmental political at the University of California at Irvine, Summer (ECSP Report 8:109-124)

In addition, **environmental security's language** and findings can benefit conservation and sustainable development."' Much environmental security literature emphasizes the importance of development assistance, sustainable livelihoods, fair and reasonable access to environmental goods, and conservation practices as the vital upstream measures that in the long run will contribute to higher levels of human and state security. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) are examples of bodies that have been quick to recognize how the language of environmental security can help them. The scarcity/conflict thesis has alerted these groups to prepare for the possibility of working on environmental rescue projects in regions that are likely to exhibit high levels of related violence and conflict. These groups are also aware that an **association with security can expand** their **acceptance and constituencies** in some countries in which the military has political control, For the first time in its history; the contemporary environmental movement can regard military and intelligence agencies as potential **allies in the struggle** to contain or reverse humangenerated environmental change. (In many situations, of course, the political history of the military--as well as its environmental record-raise serious concerns about the viability of this cooperation.) Similarly, **the language of security has provided a basis for** some **fruitful discussions** between environmental groups and representatives of extractive industries. In many parts of the world, mining and petroleum companies have become embroiled in conflict. These companies have been accused of destroying traditional economies, cultures, and environments; of political corruption; and of using private militaries to advance their interests. They have also been targets of violence, Work is now underway through the environmental security arm of the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) to address these issues with the support of multinational corporations. Third, the general conditions outlined in much environmental security research can help organizations such as USAID, the World Bank, and IUCN identify priority cases--areas in which investments are likely to have the greatest ecological and social returns. For all these reasons, IUCN elected to integrate environmental security into its general plan at the Amman Congress in 2001. Many other environmental groups and development agencies are taking this perspective seriously (e.g. Dabelko, Lonergan& Matthew, 1999). However, for the most part these efforts remain preliminary.'

Conclusions **Efforts to dismiss environment and security research and policy activities on the grounds that they have been unsuccessful are premature and misguided**. This negative criticism has all too often been based on an excessively simplified account of the research findings of Homer-Dixon and a few others. Homer-Dixon’s scarcity-conflict thesis has made important and highly visible contributions to the literature, but it is only a small part of a larger and very compelling theory. This broader theory has roots in antiquity and speaks to the pervasive conflicts and security implications of complex nature-society relationships. The theory places incidents of violence in larger structural and historical contexts while also specifying contemporarily significant clusters of variables. From this more generalized and inclusive perspective, violence and conflict are revealed rarely as a society’s endpoint and far more often as parts of complicated adaptation processes. The contemporary research on this classical problematic has helped to revive elements of security discourse and analysis that were marginalized during the Cold War. It has also made valuable contributions to our understanding of the requirements of human security, the diverse impacts of globalization, and the nature of contemporary transnational security threats. Finall,y environmental security research has been valuable in myriad ways to a range of academics, policymakers, and activists, although the full extent of these contributions remains uncertain, rather than look for reasons to abandon this research and policy agenda, **now is the time** to recognize and **to build on the** remarkable **achievements** of the entire environmental security field.

**Realism in environmental security is good- accurate**

**Gellers 10 (**Josh Gellers, third-year PhD student in Political Science at the University of California, Irvine and Assistant Director of the Focused Research Group in International Environmental Cooperation. He earned an MA in Climate and Society from Columbia University (2007) and a BA in Political Science with a minor in Geography and a certificate in International Relations from the University of Florida (2005), “Climate Change and Environmental Security: Bringing Realism Back In”, University of California, Irvine 2010)

The examples of **environmental security** issues entertained in this paper—political economy, resource scarcity, and human security—**provide** fertile **ground for** a discussion of the ways in which notions of environmental security are compatible with **realism**. 13 Regarding political economy, the economic downturn of a country caused by environmental factors has a tendency to destabilize the state when citizens become jaded by their government’s inability to provide basic human services during a time of need. Political instability can lead to internal conflict which can verily devolve into an interstate war. The focus here is not on the initial strife within the country experiencing an economic downturn as a result of climate change, but rather how one state’s economic depravity quickly becomes another state’s security threat emanating from spillover effects. Therefore, the spread of conflict originating from a neighboring state poses a significant, albeit indirect, threat due to climate change. For these reasons, the political economy approach to environmental security relates to defensive realism because powerful states would have a vested interest in seeing that the balance of power in the international system was not compromised by spillover effects.34 The resource scarcity approach approximates food, water, and energy security to environmental security. In the case of climate change, resources vital to a state’s survival are threatened by impacts on the natural environment. The resulting scarcity of vital resources leads to territorial disputes and proactive measures taken to secure the continued availability of necessities such as raw materials or petroleum. It may be therefore surmised that resource scarcity follows an **offensive realist** position. In order to maximize state power, a state may decide to take preemptive action against another state if it feels that essential resources may become scarce. This behavior seeks to ensure that great powers are able to maximize their power relative to that of other states who do not think to act decisively in an effort to procure vital resources. In essence, great powers will seek to maximize their security through aggressive means.35 Finally, human security entails a litany of threats to state survival, including food security and environmental security. Most importantly, however, human security as discussed here encapsulates threats to critical infrastructure. Devastation of critical infrastructure would translate into the mass migration of environmental refugees and expose states with overseas military assets to extraterritorial threats to regional or national security. A massive wave of environmental refugees introduced into a country would strain the ability of the recipient government to handle the increased population demanding essential human services. The elimination of foreign military bases would present strategic dilemmas to the occupying state since they, too, would be forced to either relocate or abdicate the region altogether. Permanent withdrawal from an area of strategic importance is unlikely to occur, but the initial adjustment period to either a new nearby location or temporary absence from the region could open up opportunities for aggression. Therefore, the aspects of human security discussed in this paper adhere to both defensive realist and offensive realist perspectives. Defensive realists would pay close attention to the shifting balance of power that might occur if one powerful state suffers the brunt of environmental migration and becomes weaker as a result. Offensive realists would be much more concerned about how sea level rise could (at least temporarily) obviate the peace-maintaining role of military installations abroad. In the example of China and Taiwan, China may perceive the territorial rewards of aggression substantially greater than the risks of failure and the maintenance of peace in the region. Waltz corroborates this theoretical assertion: “A state will use force to attain its goals if, after assessing the prospects for success, it values those goals more than it values the pleasures of peace.”36

**Ecosecurity solves k impacts**

**Barnett ‘1**

[Jon. Research Council in the School of Environmental Enquiry at U of Melbourne. The Meaning of Environmental Security: Ecological Politics and Policy in the New Security Era, Pg 137-40 //GBS-JV]

The question of whether it is valid to understand environmental problems as security problems recurs throughout any thoughtful discussion of environmental security. The dilemma should by now be apparent; **securitising environmental issues runs the risk that the strategic/realist approach will coopt and colonise the environmental agenda rather than respond positively to environmental problems** (as discussed in Chapter 6). For this reason critics of environmental security, such as Deudney (1991) and-Brock (1991), Suggest that it is dangerous to understand environmental problems as security issues: This book's position on the matter has been emerging in previous chapters. It contends that **the problem turns not on** **the presentation of environmental problems as security issues, but on-the meaning and practice of security in present times. Environmental security, wittingly or not, contests the legitimacy of the realist conception of security by pointing to the contradictions of security as the defence of territory and resistance to change. It seeks** **to work from within the prevailing conception of security, but** to be successful it must do so with a strong sense of purpose and a solid theoretical base. Understanding environmental problems as security problems is thus a form of conceptual speculation. It is one manifestation of the pressure the Green movement has exerted on states since the late 1960s. This pressure has pushed state legitimacy nearer to collapse, for if the state cannot control a problem as elemental as environmental degradation, then what is its purpose? This legitimacy problem suggests that environmental degradation cannot further intensify without fundamental change or the collapse of the state. This in turn implies that state-sanctioned **environmentally degrading practices such as those undertaken in the name of national security cannot extend their power further if it means further exacerbation of environmental insecurity. While the system may resist environmental security's challenge for change, it must also resist changes for the worse**. In terms of the conceptual venture, therefore, **appropriation by the security apparatus of the concept of environmental security is unlikely to result in an increase in environmental insecurity (**although the concept itself may continue to be corrupted). **On the other hand, succeeding in the conceptual venture may mean a positive modification of the theory and practice of national security. It may also mean that national governments will take environmental problems more seriously, reduce defence budgets, and generally implement policies for a more peaceful and environmentally secure world.** This dual goal of demilitarisation and upgrading policy may well be a case of wanting to have one's cake and eat it — but either the having or the eating is sufficient justification for the concept (Brock 1996). The worst outcome would be if the state ceased to use the concept of environmental security, heralding the end of the contest and requiring that the interests of peace and the environment be advocated through alternative discourses. This is perhaps the only real failure that is likely to ensue from the project of environmental security.

**Realism in environmental security is good- accurate**

**Gellers 10 (**Josh Gellers, third-year PhD student in Political Science at the University of California, Irvine and Assistant Director of the Focused Research Group in International Environmental Cooperation. He earned an MA in Climate and Society from Columbia University (2007) and a BA in Political Science with a minor in Geography and a certificate in International Relations from the University of Florida (2005), “Climate Change and Environmental Security: Bringing Realism Back In”, University of California, Irvine 2010)

The examples of **environmental security** issues entertained in this paper—political economy, resource scarcity, and human security—**provide** fertile **ground for** a discussion of the ways in which notions of environmental security are compatible with **realism**. 13 Regarding political economy, the economic downturn of a country caused by environmental factors has a tendency to destabilize the state when citizens become jaded by their government’s inability to provide basic human services during a time of need. Political instability can lead to internal conflict which can verily devolve into an interstate war. The focus here is not on the initial strife within the country experiencing an economic downturn as a result of climate change, but rather how one state’s economic depravity quickly becomes another state’s security threat emanating from spillover effects. Therefore, the spread of conflict originating from a neighboring state poses a significant, albeit indirect, threat due to climate change. For these reasons, the political economy approach to environmental security relates to defensive realism because powerful states would have a vested interest in seeing that the balance of power in the international system was not compromised by spillover effects.34 The resource scarcity approach approximates food, water, and energy security to environmental security. In the case of climate change, resources vital to a state’s survival are threatened by impacts on the natural environment. The resulting scarcity of vital resources leads to territorial disputes and proactive measures taken to secure the continued availability of necessities such as raw materials or petroleum. It may be therefore surmised that resource scarcity follows an **offensive realist** position. In order to maximize state power, a state may decide to take preemptive action against another state if it feels that essential resources may become scarce. This behavior seeks to ensure that great powers are able to maximize their power relative to that of other states who do not think to act decisively in an effort to procure vital resources. In essence, great powers will seek to maximize their security through aggressive means.35 Finally, human security entails a litany of threats to state survival, including food security and environmental security. Most importantly, however, human security as discussed here encapsulates threats to critical infrastructure. Devastation of critical infrastructure would translate into the mass migration of environmental refugees and expose states with overseas military assets to extraterritorial threats to regional or national security. A massive wave of environmental refugees introduced into a country would strain the ability of the recipient government to handle the increased population demanding essential human services. The elimination of foreign military bases would present strategic dilemmas to the occupying state since they, too, would be forced to either relocate or abdicate the region altogether. Permanent withdrawal from an area of strategic importance is unlikely to occur, but the initial adjustment period to either a new nearby location or temporary absence from the region could open up opportunities for aggression. Therefore, the aspects of human security discussed in this paper adhere to both defensive realist and offensive realist perspectives. Defensive realists would pay close attention to the shifting balance of power that might occur if one powerful state suffers the brunt of environmental migration and becomes weaker as a result. Offensive realists would be much more concerned about how sea level rise could (at least temporarily) obviate the peace-maintaining role of military installations abroad. In the example of China and Taiwan, China may perceive the territorial rewards of aggression substantially greater than the risks of failure and the maintenance of peace in the region. Waltz corroborates this theoretical assertion: “A state will use force to attain its goals if, after assessing the prospects for success, it values those goals more than it values the pleasures of peace.”36

# Politics

### A2: Grid

#### No Skill shortage- tons of H1Bs and U.S. Ph. D’s.

#### Grid is fine

Paul Clark 12, MA Candidate, Intelligence/Terrorism Studies, American Military University; Senior Analyst, Chenega Federal Systems, 4/28/12, “The Risk of Disruption or Destruction of Critical U.S. Infrastructure by an Offensive Cyber Attack,” http://blog.havagan.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/The-Risk-of-Disruption-or-Destruction-of-Critical-U.S.-Infrastructure-by-an-Offensive-Cyber-Attack.pdf

An attack against the electrical grid is a reasonable threat scenario since power systems are "a high priority target for military and insurgents" and there has been a trend towards utilizing commercial software and integrating utilities into the public Internet that has "increased vulnerability across the board" (Lewis 2010). Yet the increased vulnerabilities are mitigated by an increased detection and deterrent capability that has been "honed over many years of practical application" now that power systems are using standard, rather than proprietary and specialized, applications and components (Leita and Dacier 2012). The security of the electrical grid is also enhanced by increased awareness after a smart-grid hacking demonstration in 2009 and the identification of the Stuxnet malware in 2010: as a result the public and private sector are working together in an "unprecedented effort" to establish robust security guidelines and cyber security measures (Gohn and Wheelock 2010).

#### Defense is air gapped

**Weimann‘4** (Gabriel, senior fellow, United States Institute of Peace, Professor of Communication, University of Haifa, Israel, December (Cyberterrorism: How Real Is the Threat?, Special Report, United States Institute of Peace, p. http://www.usip.org/ pubs/specialreports/sr119.pdf)

Many computer security specialists believe it is virtually impossible to use the Internet to inflict death on a large scaleand scoff at the notion that terrorists would bother trying. The resilience of computer systems to attack, they point out, isno accident but rather the result of significant investments of time, money, and expertise. Nuclear weapons and other sensitive military systems enjoy the most basic form of Internet security. They are "air-gapped," meaning that they are not physically connected to the Internet and are therefore inaccessible to outside hackers. The Defense Department has been particularly vigilant in protecting key systems by isolating them from the Internet and even from the Pentagon's internal computer network. All new software must be submitted to the National Security Agency for security testing.

### Subs Thumps

#### Nuclear sub discussion in budget causes fights – blame shifting

AFP 2/26/13

(Agence France Presse -- English¶ “US leaders squabble despite Bernanke cuts warning” February 26, 2013 Tuesday 7:43 PM GMT Lexis, TSW)

US Fed chairman Ben Bernanke Tuesday sounded the alarm over huge budget cuts looming within 72 hours, but political leaders traded blame rather than fixing a row threatening the fragile economy.¶ President Barack Obama traveled Tuesday to a Virginia shipyard that builds nuclear-powered aircraft carriers and submarines for the US Navy, amid fears the cuts, known as the sequester, will damage America's defense readiness.¶ "These cuts are wrong, they are not smart, they are not fair," Obama said in a vast assembly hall at Newport News Shipbuilding, with a yet-to-be-attached ship propeller behind him, and the nose section of a submarine to his right.¶ "They are a self-inflicted wound that doesn't have to happen."¶ But Republicans accused Obama of exploiting the military and refused to accept his demand to raise more taxes on the rich and corporations as part of the solution to the showdown over $85 billion in cuts due to hit on Friday.

### Biofuels Thumps

#### Biofuel program disproves link

Daily Caller 3/21

(“Senate lets the Navy’s ‘green fleet’ sail on” http://dailycaller.com/2013/03/21/senate-lets-the-navys-green-fleet-sail-on/)

The Senate defeated a proposed amendment that would have transferred money from the Navy’s biofuels program to increase the Defense Department’s operations and maintenance funding.¶ “I have been arguing for weeks that cuts to the budget can be made in a smarter way. In light of all of the waste, duplication, and lower priority spending in the federal government, I am confident that we can make more sensible cuts in spending than severely reducing the Army’s operations and maintenance work,” said Pennsylvania Republican Sen. Pat Toomey, who offered the amendment.¶ The Senate rejected the amendment in a 40-59 vote which would have redirected $60 million from military biofuels testing.¶ The military’s use of biofuels came under fire from Republicans last year who argued the fuel was expensive and inefficient.¶ “Given tightening budgets, it makes little sense to waste money on inefficient, overpriced energy sources when we could use those same funds to help support critical maintenance services for the warfighter,” Toomey added.

### Guns

#### Their ev doesn’t say Obama bill kills CIR.

#### Guns thumps

The Frontrunner 3-26

“Obama to Campaign Across the Country for Gun Measures,” lexis

The Hill (3/26, Sink, 21K) reports President Obama "will hit the road to rally Senate support for new gun controls in coming weeks, seeking to frame upcoming votes on an assault weapons ban and universal background checks as tests of political courage for skittish Democrats." White House spokesman Josh Earnest said on Monday, "I do anticipate that you will see the president using the power of the bully pulpit, as you describe it, by traveling across the country a little bit and talking about some of these issues."

### Defense Shielded

#### Defenses transferes draw no congressional interest

McCain 3-12

“Remarks by John McCain on Congress and the Budget,” lexis

"In fiscal year 2011 alone, the Department transferred nearly $27 billion among Defense accounts - less than half of which received any type of congressional oversight. And that oversight was limited to just four senators (the chairmen and ranking members of the defense committees) out of a hundred. Despite that the Department cannot be audited, we continue to provide it with the 'flexibility' to engage in what amounts to budgetary gamesmanship - where certain accounts (such as operations and maintenance and base-operations support, which are intended to satisfy must-pay bills) are historically underfunded in the President's annual budget requests, with the understanding that the Department will be able to transfer funds among accounts down-the-road.¶ "In my view, this type of budgetary gamesmanship is a big reason why the Department cannot annually produce auditable financial statements and frustrates Congress' ability to objectively assess the priority or urgency of the Department's requirements. Against this backdrop, sequestration came along.¶ "There can be no doubt that sequestration was a bad idea. And there is much blame to go around for it.¶ "What I came to realize only recently is this: Congress has, over time, so thoroughly abandoned Regular Order and abrogated its Constitutional prerogative over how the Executive Branch spends taxpayer monies that sequestration, which was originally sold to us as impossible and something that the President said last year during the presidential campaign would 'never happen,' was in actuality inevitable.

**UQ O/W**

**Uniqueness Overwhelms the Link**

**Kroger 3-12**

Gregory is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Miami, “The Hastert Rule: It’s More like a Guideline,” <http://mischiefsoffaction.blogspot.com/2013/03/the-hastert-rule-its-more-like-guideline.html>

Last week the U.S. House passed a bill supported by a majority of the Democratic party and a minority faction of the Republican members, even though the Republicans are the majority party and control access to the House floor. This has occurred three times in the last three months:¶ Jan. 1, Extending and revising tax breaks, passed 257-167 (Dems 172-16; GOP 85-151)¶ Jan. 15, Hurricane Sandy Relief, passed 241-180 (Dems 192-1, GOP 49-179)¶ Feb. 28, Violence Against Women Act, passed 286-138 (Dems 199-0; GOP 87-138)¶ These are rare violations of the Hastert Rule, which states that bills should only come to the floor of the U.S. House if they are supported by "a majority of the majority." But the fact that these rare events occurred at all has sparked much consternation among political scientists seeking to understand these rare cracks in the House majority party's hegemony, and conservatives flabbergasted that the GOP party leaders are not blocking progressive legislation from the floor of the House.¶ The Logic of the Hastert Rule¶ The implicit premise of the Hastert rule is that the majority party in the U.S. House is best understood as an organizational conspiracy. Majority party members are expected to vote for their party's Speaker candidate (sorry, Seth), support the adoption of the majority-proposed chamber rules, and vote for the "special rules" that bring major bills to the House floor on terms dictated by the majority party. "Special rules" are as oxymoronic as they sound: each major bill gets its own set of debate terms as proposed by the Rules Committee. By buying into leaders that they may not love, rules and special rules that constrain them, the members of the majority party gain the power to keep bills off the floor entirely and to screen the amendments that come to a roll call vote.¶ The primary academic account of legislative parties as organizational conspiracies is provided by the research of Gary Cox and Mathew McCubbins. The theoretical basis of the Hastert rule is provided in chapter 3 of their 2005 book Setting the Agenda. Chapter 2 of the book, however, lays out the more fundamental logic of legislative parties: just win [elections], baby. **Parties are organizations striving to win elections by protecting and enhancing the "brand name" of the party**.¶ How do they do this? Usually, they try to keep their "sharpest conflicts" out of public view. The Hastert Rule is an expression of this goal: all else equal, the majority party looks bad when it brings up legislation that reveals its internal divisions. A vote that divides the members of the majority party is usually a tough vote, one that forces members to choose between their base constituencies and the general public (e.g. pro-life activists and the median voter), or between subconstituencies they do not wish to offend (e.g. Kansas Republicans voting on government payments to farmers).¶ Elections, not Policy¶ BUT: policy outcomes are secondary to the true goals of political parties. **While individual House members may be true conservatives and sincerely desire to implement conservative policies, this is not why the House Republican party exists. Its true purpose is to win elections. If it is in the electoral interests of the Republican party to bring up legislation opposed by most of the House GOP and allow it to pass, it is their job to do so**. **What kinds of bills are good for the GOP brand but unworthy of GOP members' votes?**¶ **must-pass legislation**, e.g. reauthorization bills, debt limit increases, and arguably the January 2013 tax deal. **Even if the members are disappointed by the outcome of bargaining with the Senate and White House, it is usually in their interest to allow these bargains to pass rather than bear responsibility for the chaos of blocking such bills.**¶Proposals advanced by the opposing party that are so popular--and marketed so effectively--that killing them would be more costly than letting them pass. Note that "letting the Wookiee win" can be a very effective electoral strategy because the majority party deprives its opposition of a major campaign issue. Possible case: minimum wage increase. ¶ **Proposals that are in the long term interests of the party coalition but not the short term interests of current majority party officeholders. Current example: immigration reform.**¶ At the same time, there are proposals that would get the support of most House Republicans but would NOT be in the political interests of the Republican party. At the risk of being uncharitable, it would seem from the 2012 cycle that eliminating the rape exception for an abortion could get the votes of many House GOP conservatives but be harmful to the party brand.¶ Still confused? Maybe a Venn diagram will help:¶ Ideally, the GOP leaders schedules bills from the intersection of the two circles. They probably have to deal with activists and interest groups who swear that their idea is in the intersection, and not just popular with conservatives. And if the Democrats are organized and strategic (that's an IF), they work to move their favorite proposals from outside the circles into the blue circle, so that the GOP either allows their bills to come to the floor (a win) or keeps popular legislation off the floor (also a win). But the lesson of the last three months is that there are bills in the blue circle outside of the intersection; sometimes it is in the electoral interests of the House GOP to let themselves lose.

### PC Not Key

#### PC not key to immigration

Hirsch 2-7

Michael is Chief Correspondent for National Journal, “There’s no Such Thing as Political Capital,” <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.

#### 

### No PC

**No PC now**

**Vespa 3-22**

[Matt, Writer for NewsBusters, “CBS Political Director Now: Obama Shouldn't Agitate GOP; Back in January: 'Go For The Throat,' Mr. President” http://www.newsbusters.org/blogs/matt-vespa/2013/03/22/180-turn-cbs-political-director-says-obama-shouldnt-agitate-gop-said-go-]

Don't look for Dickerson's colleagues in the liberal media to examine this stunning reversal. Doing so would highlight that **Obama fatigue is slowly but surely setting in, not just in Washington but in the hinterland**. The **president won a second term, but he lacks the political capital to set the agenda on his terms. He cannot negotiate from a position of strength because he has none**. Dickerson now sees it, and surely others in the media do as well. The question is when will the media start to note openly that the emperor has no clothes.

### No Obama Bill

#### Obama won’t introduce his own bill

**ABC Univision 3/27**/13 (President Obama Expects Immigration Bill In April, http://abcnews.go.com/ABC\_Univision/News/immigration-reform-obama-expects-bill-april/story?id=18825428)

"**I'm actually optimistic** that when they get back they will introduce a bill," **Obama said** during an interview with Univision. "My sense is that they have come close and my expectation is that we'll actually see a bill on the floor of the Senate next month." The **president has** repeatedly **said that he would propose his own** **immigration bill** **should negotiations** in Congress grind to a **halt**. **But Obama refused to say that he would take such action even if the lawmakers fail to introduce a bill in April**. "I'm not going to presuppose that they don't [reach an agreement]," he said. When Obama was asked if immigration reform could still get done by summer, a goal he set out earlier this year, the president replied, "I believe so."

# DoD Budget

### Cheaper than anything that’s electiricity

### Plan Saves Money

#### Fuel costs spill-over and destroy the DOD budget

Freed 12 Josh, Vice President for Clean Energy, Third Way, “Improving capability, protecting 'budget”, May 21, <http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2012/05/powering-our-military-whats-th.php>

As Third Way explains in a digest being released this week by our National Security Program, the Pentagon’s efforts to reduce energy demand and find alternative energy sources could keep rising fuel costs from encroaching on the budgets of other important defense programs. And the payoff could be massive. The Air Force has already been able to implement behavioral and technology changes that will reduce its fuel costs by $500 million over the next five years. The Army has invested in better energy distribution systems at several bases in Afghanistan, which will save roughly $100 million each year. And, using less than 10% of its energy improvement funds, the Department has begun testing advanced biofuels for ships and planes. This relatively small investment could eventually provide the services with a cost-effective alternative to the increasingly expensive and volatile oil markets. These actions are critical to the Pentagon’s ability to focus on its defense priorities. As Secretary Panetta recently pointed out, he’s facing a $3 billion budget shortfall caused by “higher-than-expected fuel costs.” The Department’s energy costs could rise even further if action isn’t taken. DOD expects to spend $16 billion on fuel next year. The Energy Information Administration predicts the price of oil will rise 23% by 2016, without a major disruption in oil supplies, like the natural disasters, wars, and political upheaval the oil producing states have seen during the last dozen years. Meanwhile, the Pentagon’s planned budget, which will remain flat for the foreseeable future, will require significant adjustment to the Department’s pay-any-price mindset, even if sequestration does not go into effect. Unless energy costs are curbed, they could begin to eat into other budget priorities for DOD. In addition, the Pentagon’s own Defense Science Board acknowledges that using energy more efficiently makes our forces more flexible and resilient in military operations, and can provide them with greater endurance during missions. Also, by reducing energy demand in the field, DOD can minimize the number of fuel convoys that must travel through active combat zones, reducing the chances of attack to avoiding casualties and destruction of material. At our domestic bases, DOD is employing energy conservation, on-site clean energy generation, and smart grid technology to prevent disruptions to vital activities in case the civilian grid is damaged by an attack or natural disaster. The bottom line is, developing methods and technologies to reduce our Armed Forces’ use of fossil fuels and increase the availability of alternative energy makes our military stronger. That’s why the Pentagon has decided to invest in these efforts.

### 1NC- A2: Food Shortages

#### Supply and demand means farmers will make more food – empirically true

Zubrin ‘11

Dr. Robert Zubrin Fellow with the Center for Security Policy B.A. in Mathematics from the University of Rochester (1974), and a masters degree in Aeronautics and Astronautics, a masters degree in Nuclear Engineering, and a Ph.D. in Nuclear Engineering “WHY IT’S WRONG TO AGREE WITH THE MALTHUSIANS ABOUT ETHANOL” <http://www.ilcorn.org/daily-update/182-why-it-rsquo-s-wrong-to-agree-with-the-malthusians-about-ethanol/>

In fact, Lester Brown is wrong about the alleged famine-inducing potential of the ethanol program for exactly the same reason he has been repeatedly wrong about the alleged famine-inducing potential of population growth. There is not a fixed amount of grain in the world. Farmers produce in response to demand. The more customers, the more grain. Not only that, but the larger the potential market, the greater the motivation for investment in improved techniques. This is why, despite the fact that the world population has indeed doubled since Lester Brown, Paul Ehrlich, and the other population control zealots first published their manifestos during the 1960s, people worldwide are eating much better today than they were then. In the case of America’s corn growing industry, the beneficial effect of a growing market has been especially pronounced, with corn yields per acre in 2010 (165 bushels per acre) being 37 percent higher than they were in 2002 (120 bushels per acres) and more than four times as great as they were in 1960 (40 bushels per acre.)

#### 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.

#### Empirically denied – innovation solves

Wish 10

Vladish Wish, writer for Allianz (study of demographics) “Who’s Afraid of Thomas Malthus?” Global |01 October 2010by Valdis Wish <http://knowledge.allianz.com/?224>

None of the troubling predictions about overpopulation and global starvation have come to pass. So should we still be worried about too many people on Earth? The specter of too many people and not enough food has haunted scientists and philosophers since at least the time of Aristotle. The most famous is Thomas Malthus, who in 1798 grimly predicted that population growth would outpace food production, resulting in human death and misery. The Industrial Revolution and new agricultural techniques during the 19th century, however, helped prevent a major global starvation. Over 150 years later, Paul R. Ehrlich published a bestselling book called "The Population Bomb," in which he projected the starvation of hundreds of millions during the 1970s-80s. While the world saw some devastating famines during those decades—in Bangladesh and Ethiopia, for example—they were not on the global scale that Ehrlich had predicted. But even after history proved Malthus and Ehrlich wrong, theories about the dangers of overpopulation still capture the public interest. Jared Diamond, author of the bestseller "Collapse", says humanity still faces a perilous "population explosion" in the coming decades. His book describes the bloody events in Rwanda, one of the world's most densely populated countries, during the 1990s to illustrate what can happen when population growth converges with problems like environmental degradation and food shortages. Diffusing the population bomb Malthus, Ehrlich, and Diamond all have their critics, mainly economists and theorists who deny that population growth negatively affects quality of life. One of them is U.S. political economist Nicholas Eberstadt, who argues that overpopulation alone is not to blame for poor living conditions. Global living standards, he notes, have improved dramatically during the 20th century despite a near-quadrupling of the human population. "In most people's minds, the notions of 'overpopulation,' 'overcrowding,' or 'too many people' are associated with images of hungry children, unchecked disease, squalid living conditions, and awful slums," writes Eberstadt. "But the proper name for those conditions is human poverty." Countries like Taiwan, South Korea, or the Netherlands show that densely populated countries can prosper as well. Nonetheless, concerns that population growth obstructs development have inspired large-scale family planning measures since the 1950s. In 1969, the UN created the UN Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA), which supports family planning initiatives worldwide. In the late 1970s, the Chinese government introduced its famous one-child-per-family policy. While many question whether such schemes are humane, the policy clearly slowed down Chinese population growth to the extent that India will soon be the world's most populous country.

# Helium

### Not Blimps

#### Their disad is about blimps- we’re kites

NBC News 10

(Jennifer Alsever, “Innovations to boost airborne energy have wind at their back” http://www.nbcnews.com/id/39851579/ns/business-going\_green/#.UTz3yRzqmz4)

Other startups take a different approach to mile-high wind. Magenn Power in Mountain View, Calif., is building helium blimps that use fabric sails to capture wind and send energy down cable tethers. Buoyed by $9 million from investors and a $500,000 grant from the Asia-Pacific Partnership, Magenn may be about a year away from marketing the airships.¶ Just down the highway in California is Joby Energy, a venture started in 2008 by entrepreneur JoeBen Bevirt, who sold his last company to Agilent Technologies. The Santa Cruz company’s 35 employees designed autonomous gliders that carry rotor turbines tied to the ground.¶ And in Italy, a company called KiteGen uses a pulley system attached to a single kite flying at 2,624 feet to activate alternators below and produce electricity. The company hopes to start selling its airborne power systems sometime next year.

### Hodgepodge of Claims

#### Spikes inev and non-unique but long-term production is inevitable---the aff has zero effect

Lundblad 9/11—The News Herald (Elizabeth, Helium shortage being felt at party supply stores, florists, [www.news-herald.com/articles/2012/09/11/news/doc504f7974c9ebc643495288.txt?viewmode=fullstory](http://www.news-herald.com/articles/2012/09/11/news/doc504f7974c9ebc643495288.txt?viewmode=fullstory))

The lack of supply has sent prices soaring.¶ Last week the price of a tank of helium went up by $100, Hannan said. Four years ago he was paying roughly $70 for a tank, now it’s more than $200.¶ “Helium is a natural byproduct of natural gas. How in the world … we have a surplus of natural gas, how are we having shortage of helium?” he added. “It makes no sense to me.”¶ Like most everything, it comes down to economics.¶ “There is definitely a helium shortage. It’s been going on for probably 18 months and will probably continue for another six months,” said Joe Peterson, assistant field manager of helium resources for the Bureau of Land Management in Amarillo, Texas.¶ When the global economic downturn hit in 2008, production of natural gas, and therefore helium, slowed, creating a “supply-demand imbalance,” Peterson said. Global demand has also increased, further straining the supply.¶ “There have been cutbacks at plants throughout the world,” he added. “As far as long term availability of helium, there is not a foreseeable shortage of helium as a resource in the world. There are sources of helium that have been identified but have not been tapped.”

### No Impact

#### No impact---major helium users aren’t affected by the shortage or spikes

Nicodemus 12—Reporter at Worcester Telegram & Gazette (3/25/12, Aaron, With luck, we’ll all survive the helium shortage, [www.telegram.com/article/20120325/COLUMN73/103259959/1002](http://www.telegram.com/article/20120325/COLUMN73/103259959/1002))

But apparently, the worldwide helium shortage is expected to last through the rest of the year. ¶ Helium, an inert gas, is used for a variety of commercial and industrial purposes. Hospitals and other medical institutions use liquid helium to cool components of magnetic resonance imaging machines. The government uses helium in liquid-fueled rockets, and in supersonic wind tunnels. ¶ In the last helium shortage, in 2006, the Macy’s Thanksgiving Day parade was forced to use fewer giant inflatable cartoon characters because there was not enough helium to fill them all. ¶ This time around, larger users of helium don’t seem to be affected. ¶ UMass Memorial Medical Center and the University of Massachusetts Medical School, both in Worcester, report through their spokesmen that the institutions use little helium and their supply has not been affected. ¶ It’s the mom and pop florists and balloon shops that are finding helium a little hard to find. ¶ “The balloon guys, they’re not strategic,” said John R. Campbell, owner and publisher of CryoGas International, a trade publication for the gas industry based in Lexington. “The first thing that comes off are the balloon guys.” ¶ Industrial-grade helium, the purer stuff used for liquefied helium, has a higher profit margin. This protects larger users from feeling the effects of a shortage, according to Jay Kapur, general manager at Aimtek Inc. in Auburn

## A2: Biofuels

#### Biofuels fail- too expensive still environmental regs

Skye 10

(“Advantages and Disadvantages of Biofuels” http://greenliving.lovetoknow.com/Advantages\_and\_Disadvantages\_of\_Biofuels)

### Production carbon emissions: Several studies have been conducted to analyze the carbon footprint of biofuels, and while they may be cleaner to burn, there are strong indications that the process to produce the fuel - including the machinery necessary to cultivate the crops and the plants to produce the fuel - has hefty carbon emissions.

#### All life has value

L Schwartz, medical ethicist, 2002, Medical ethics: a case based approach, www.fleshandbones.com/readingroom/pdf/399.pdf

Supporters of the sanctity of life ethic dismiss considerations about quality and quantity because, they assert: • all life is worth living under any condition because of • the inherent value of life. The upshot

High cost: To refine biofuels to more efficient energy outputs, and to build the necessary manufacturing plants to increase biofuel quantities, a high initial investment is often required.

## K

### Always V2L

of the theory is that quality of life, although desirable, is irrelevant to assessing the value of a life because all life is inherently valuable. Many supporters of the sanctity of life criterion say this is true only of human life, but there are religious groups who claim sanctity extends to all life. Either way, the sanctity of life principle states that all human life is worthy of preservation and hence eliminates the justifiability of abortion, euthanasia and rational suicide and, at extremes, withdrawal of futile treatment: The sanctity of life ethic holds that every human life is intrinsically good, that no life is more valuable than another, that lives not fully developed (embryonic and fetal stages) and lives with no great potential (the suffering lives of the terminally ill or the pathetic lives of the severely handicapped) are still sacred. The condition of a life does not reduce its value or justify its termination.6 So, whereas to determine the value of a life on its quality asserts that there is a relevant difference between the type of life and the fact of life, this distinction is rejected by sanctity arguments as irrelevant. The sanctity criterion tends to be associated with religious beliefs. The Judeo-Christian rationale is usually that lives are inherently valuable because they are gifts from God and not ours to end as we wish. In a sense, our lives are on loan to us and, as such, must be treated with respect. In Islam, the suffering associated with reduced quality of life is also considered a divine endowment and therefore ought to The value of life: who decides and how? 115 be borne without assistance, as the suffering is said to lead to enlightenment and divine reward. However, religious arguments are not required to defend sanctity beliefs. It is enough simply to say that all human lives are deserving of equal respect not because of what they have to offer or have offered or potentially will offer, but because they exist. The notion of inalienable human rights attributes force to the value of human life with the assertion that it needs no justification. This is the primary merit of the sanctity of life ethic – that a life requires no justification – but justification is required for the premature termination of that life. In this sense, the principle acts as a forceful bulwark against devaluing human life. Article 3 of the United Nations Declaration of Human rights asserts simply that: Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.7 No argument is made to justify this claim because no argument is necessary. However, it will be necessary to justify any violation of this right.

### High Impact Outweighs

#### Even slight risks of catastrophic impacts outweigh

**Rescher, 83** (Nicholas, Department of Philosophy at the University of Pittsburgh, Risk: A Philosophical Introduction to the theory of risk evaluation, p. 67)

In such situations we are dealing with hazards that are just not in the same league. Certain hazards are simply unacceptable because they involve a relatively unacceptable threat—things may go wrong so badly that, relative to the alternatives, it’s just not worthwhile to “run the risk,” even in the face of a favorable balance of probabilities. The rational man is not willing to trade off against one another by juggling probabilities such outcomes as the loss of one hair and the loss of his health or his freedom. The imbalance or disparity between risks is just too great to be restored by probablistic readjustments. They are (probablistically) incommersuable: confronted with such “incomparable” hazards, we do not bother to weigh this “balance of probabilities” at all, but simply dismiss one alternative as involving risks that are, in the circumstances, “unacceptable”.

### Democracy Good

#### Democracy improves basic rights, autonomy, and agency

de Zeeuw and Kumar ‘6

Promoting Democracy in Postconflict Societies. Edited by Jeroen de zeeuw and Krishna Kumar. 2006. pg. 5-6

International donors believe—with considerable justification—that democracy offers the best chance to promote peace and heal the wounds of war in postconflict societies. This belief is partly based on the much debated “democratic peace thesis,” which holds that democracies do not go to war with one another, thereby presenting an argument in favor of having a democratic state in order to prevent future conflict.’2 More important, however, is that a democratic political order provides mechanisms to resolve political conflicts in a peaceful manner. Elected authorities are less likely to be challenged as ‘illegitimate” than are dictatorships. As the incumbents must face elections, they are less apt to resort to violence to put down dissent. 13 A democratic order is founded on individual rights and the rule of law, and provides citizens and groups unfettered opportunities to articulate their interests and mobilize public opinion for them. A liberal democracy protects minority rights, at least in theory if not always in practice. While one should not idealize the role of democracy—and there are abundant examples where political parties have shamelessly used the fear of a minority to capture power through elections—one cannot deny that democracies fare better than authoritarian regimes in protecting ethnic and religious minorities. Finally, it is important to note that many international policy- makers view democracy promotion in war-torn societies as an important element in combating international terrorism. Many experts believe that autocratic regimes that prohibit political participation and freedom of speech can serve as breeding grounds for international terrorists.

### Inevitable

**CHALECKI 2K7**

[Elizabeth, “environmental security: a case study of climate change”, pacific institute for studies in development, environment and safety, Asst. Professor in the International Studies Program at Boston College<http://www.pacinst.org/reports/environment_and_security/env_security_and_climate_change.pdf>]

**Climate change will mean more natural disasters as a result of shifting weather and precipitation patterns.** T**he Midwest will face a greater risk of tornadoes and riverine floods, the Gulf Coast and other shorelines will face a greater risk of high seas and hurricanes**, and (due to changes in amount and timing of precipitation) the West will face greater risk of wildfires. T**hese disasters will change the readiness of the military by forcing the reallocation of troops away from combat operations toward disaster relief.** In addition, **countries less able to cope with natural disasters will likely face large numbers of refugees, either internally or from nearby countries. As they compete with the local population for scarce resources, civil and ethnic unrest may require peacekeeping troops.**

### A2: Discourse

**Prioritization of discourse destroys critique – discussing questions of implementation are key to progressive change**

**Brown ‘01**

Wendy Brown, Poli Sci and Women’s Studies @ Berkeley, ‘1 (Politics Out of History, p. 35-6)

**“Speech codes kill critique**,” Henry Louis **Gates remarked** in a 1993 essay on hate speech.14 Although **Gates was referring to what happens when** hate speech regulations, and the **debates about them, usurp the discursive space in which one might have offered a substantive political response to bigoted epithets**, his point also applies to prohibitions against questioning from within selected political practices or institutions. But **turning political questions into moralistic ones – as speech codes of any sort do – not only prohibits certain questions** and mandates certain genuflections, it also **expresses a profound hostility toward political life insofar as it seeks to preempt argument with a legislated and enforced truth**. And the realization of **that** patently undemocratic desire **can only and always convert emancipatory aspirations into reactionary ones**. Indeed, **it insulates those aspirations from questioning at the very moment that** Weberian **forces of rationalization and bureaucratization are quite likely to be domesticating them from another direction**. Here we greet a persistent political paradox: the moralistic defense of critical practices, or of any besieged identity, weakens what it strives to fortify precisely by sequestering those practices from the kind of critical inquiry out of which they were born. Thus Gates might have said, “Speech codes, born of social critique, kill critique.” And, we might add, contemporary identity-based institutions, born of social critique, invariably become conservative as they are forced to essentialize the identity and naturalize the boundaries of what they once grasped as a contingent effect of historically specific social powers. But **moralistic reproaches to certain kinds of speech or argument kill critique** not only by displacing it with arguments about abstract rights versus identity-bound injuries, but also **by configuring political injustice** and political righteousness **as a problem of remarks, attitude, and speech rather than as a matter of** historical, **political-economic** and cultural **formations of power. Rather than offering analytically substantive accounts of the forces of injustice** or injury, **they condemn the manifestation of these forces in particular remarks** or events. **There is**, in the inclination to ban (formally or informally) certain utterances and to mandate others, **a politics of rhetoric** and gesture **that itself symptomizes despair over effecting change at more significant levels. As vast quantities of** left and liberal **attention go to determining what socially marked individuals say, how they are represented**, and how many of each kind appear in certain institutions or are appointed to various commissions, **the sources that generate racism, poverty, violence against women, and other elements of social injustice remain relatively unarticulated and unaddressed. We** are lost as how to address those sources; but **rather than examine this loss** or disorientation, rather than bear the humiliation of our impotence, **we posture as if we were still fighting the big and good fight in our clamor over words and names**. Don’t mourn, moralize.