# Conditionality Good – 2NC/1NR Frontline

#### New aff means we get to do anything we want – key to test the aff holistically

#### 1. Interpretation – the Neg gets 3 advocacies and the status quo. Solves infinite regression and fairness

#### 2. Neg flex: we need to test the Aff from multiple angles. Outweighs Aff ground – they have structural advantages like 1st and last speech and infinite prep.

#### 3. Conditional advocacies force the 2AC to make their best responses which increases analytical education

#### 4. Reading a K and a CP in the same debate allows Ideological flexibility - They cause balkanization and fracturing of debate – destroying the community

#### 5. Logic – proving the counterplan bad doesn’t prove the plan good. Status quo should always be an option.

#### 6. Time and strat skews are inevitable because we could just read more T args which are no cost options

#### 7. Theory interps are arbitrary and self-serving – punish us for what we did not what we justify.

# Neolib K – Framework – Frontline

#### Our interpretation is the judge should be an intellectual grading the foundation upon which 1AC stems from---if we win the foundations of the aff are suspect we should win irrespective of hypothetical enactment

#### Method first key-otherwise alternative modes of knowledge concerning neoliberalism are delegitimized

**Gunder et al., Aukland University senior planning lecturer, 2009**

(Michael, Planning in Ten Words or Less: A Lacanian Entanglement with Spatial Planning pgs 111-2, ldg)

The hegemonic network, or bloc, initially shapes the debates and draws on appropriate policies of desired success, such as the needs of bohemians, knowledge clusters, or talented knowledge workers, as to what constitutes their desired enjoyment (cobblestones, chrome and cappuccinos at sidewalk cafes) and what is therefore lacking in local competitiveness. In tum, this defines what is blighted and dysfunctional and in need of economic, spatial planning, or other, remedy. Such an argument is predicated on a logic, or more accurately a rhetoric, that a lack of a particular defined type of enjoyment, or competitiveness (for surely they are one and the same) is inherently unhealthy for the aggregate social body. Lack and its resolution are generally presented as technical, rather than political issues. Consequently, technocrats in partnership with their "˜dominant stakeholders` can ensure the impression of rationally seeking to produce happiness for the many whilst, of course, achieving their stakeholders' specific interests (Gunder and Hillier 2007a, 469). The current "˜post-democratic` milieu facilitates the above through avoidance of critical policy debate challenging favored orthodox positions and policy approaches. Consideration of policy deficiencies, or alternative solutions, are eradicated from political debate so that while "˜token institutions of liberal democracy' are retained conflicting positions and arguments are negated (Stavrakakis 2003, 59). Consequently, "˜the safe names in the field who feed the policy orthodoxy are repeatedly used or their work drawn upon. by different stakeholders. while more critical voices are silenced by their inability to shape policy debates' (Boland 2007, 1032). The economic development or spatial planning policy analyst thus continues to partition reality ideologically by deploying only the orthodox "˜successful' or "˜best practice' economic development or spatial planning responses. This further maintains the dominant, or hegemonic, status quo while providing "˜a cover and shield against critical thought by acting in the manner of a "buffer" isolating the political held Rom any research that is independent and radical in its conception as in its implications for public policy' (Wacquant 2004, 99). At the same time, adoption of the hegemonic orthodoxy tends to generate similar policy responses for every competing local area or city-region. largely resulting in a zero-sum game (Blair and Kumar 1997).

#### Policy making isn’t grounded in objectivity but cherry picking. Means a residual link takes out the aff because the ideological underpinnings of their knowledge is inaccurate.

**Bristow, Cardiff University economic geographer senior lecturer, 2005**

(Gillian, “Everyone's a ‘winner’: problematising the discourse of regional competitiveness”, Journal of Economic Geography, June, oxford journals, ldg)

This begs the question as to why a discourse with ostensibly confused, narrow and ill-defined content has become so salient in regional economic development policy and practice as to constitute ‘the only valid currency of argument’ (Schoenberger, 1998, 12). Whilst alternative discourses based around co-operation can be conceived (e.g. see Hines, 2000; Bunzl, 2001), they have as yet failed to make a significant impact on the dominant view that a particular, quantifiable form of output-related regional competitiveness is inevitable, inexorable and ultimately beneficial. The answer appears to lie within the policy process, which refers to all aspects involved in the provision of policy direction for the work of the public sector. This therefore includes ‘the ideas which inform policy conception, the talk and work which goes into providing the formulation of policy directions, and all the talk, work and collaboration which goes into translating these into practice’ (Yeatman, 1998; p. 9). A major debate exists in the policy studies literature about the scope and limitations of reason, analysis and intelligence in policy-making—a debate which has been re-ignited with the recent emphasis upon evidence-based policy-making (see Davies et al., 2000). Keynes is often cited as the main proponent of the importance of ideas in policy making, since he argued that policy-making should be informed by knowledge, truth, reason and facts (Keynes, 1971, vol. xxi, 289). However, Majone (1989) has significantly challenged the assumption that policy makers engage in a purely objective, rational, technical assessment of policy alternatives. He has argued that in practice, policy makers use theory, knowledge and evidence selectively to justify policy choices which are heavily based on value judgements. It is thus persuasion (through rhetoric, argument, advocacy and their institutionalisation) that is the key to the policy process, not the logical correctness or accuracy of theory or data. In other words, it is interests rather than ideas that shape policy making in practice. Ultimately, the language of competitiveness is the language of the business community. Thus, critical to understanding the power of the discourse is firstly, understanding the appeal and significance of the discourse to business interests and, secondly, exploring their role in influencing the ideas of regional and national policy elites.

# Neolib K – Framework – Frontline

#### Questioning underlying structure of neoliberalism first is key-otherwise policy analysis is predetermined in favor of the market.

**Murphy, Miami sociology professor, 2005**

(John, Globalization with a Human Face, pg 11-13, ldg)

Murphy 4

The process of development, now commonly referred to as globalization, has been analyzed in a variety of ways. The political, cultural, and economic aspects of globalization, for example, have been the focus of attention of many books and articles for quite some time. What is missing, however, is a deeper level of analysis that Leonardo Boff believes is necessary to correctly understand social growth and the allocation of resources.' In this chapter, this approach is referred to as an ontological Assessment. Within this context of development, the term ontological refers to the base, or conceptual foundation, of a particular rendition of growth. No matter what theory is adopted, an image of how the social world operates is conveyed. And as part of this picture, questions are presupposed about the prospects for growth, who controls this process, the range of acceptable possibilities, and the source of all change. These considerations serve as the background assumptions that gradually begin to dictate how development will proceed. These precepts, in other words, establish the parameters of the version of reality that is suggested, often quite subtly, by a particular theory of development. For this reason, these issues are referred to as ontological or foundational. This is not to say that political analysis is irrelevant when globalization. Nonetheless, in the absence of ontological questions political assessment is not often very insightful. For example, take the problem of alienation. Often capitalism is presumed to be the key culprit with regard to producing this personal and social malady. Without a doubt, workers are treated as commodities within this production system, and thus they are transformed into objects and become alienated, as Marx says, from themselves, other persons, and the social world in general. But is a change at the political level sufficient to address this condition? Subsequent to the work of the Frankfurt School, for example, the answer to this query is no. Does a shift to the collective ownership of the means of production necessarily guarantee the eradication of alienation? Many traditional Marxists believed that this linkage was essential to building a new, more humane world. Nonetheless, they were wrong, and their lack of insight into important ontological issues contributed to discrediting in many intellectual circles a theory that otherwise provided a trenchant critique of capitalism. Shifting to collective ownership, simply put, did not address the origin or grounding of production systems. As a result, workers within socialism, similar to those within capitalism, were integrated into a system of production that was understood to exist sui generis. The result of this maneuver, of course was more—although unexpected—alienation, because the workplace was assumed to be unrelated to human desires and interests. Most important at this juncture is that many persons nowadays are criticizing globalization in an equally superficial manner. Economic and political analyses are inaugurated with the aim of illustrating the inhumanity of this worldwide process. In the opinion of many critics, not much more proof is required to demonstrate the economic and cultural inequities that this trend has spawned. Many cultures have been decimated because of the so-called adjustment policies imposed by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. The rich seem to be getting richer, while others are falling into despair and becoming increasingly marginalized. But is this sort of critique automatically enlightening? Clearly the dismal living conditions of much of the world are revealed; the divide between the rich and poor countries has never been clearer. Yet what about the prospects for change? As Giulio Girardi describes, this sort of research has simply reinforced in the minds of many persons the idea that this situation is normal? The message is that the world is comprised of rich and poor people, and that the human condition is undoubtedly nasty in many places throughout the world. Accordingly, the rich appear to have a historical mandate to govern the world and amass wealth at the expense of the rest of humanity. Proposing change is simply folly that contradicts human nature. So what is needed to alter this scenario? Referring back to Marx, at the heart of the revolution must be philosophy. Ontological questions must be raised, in other words, so that a critique of globalization is not equated with cynicism and inaction, or merely providing alternatives, such as a welfare net, that are touted to humanize this process. What is needed, instead, is a new relationship between globalization and those who are affected by this activity. But, again, this shift is not necessarily a part of political analysis. The necessary change must be made initially at the level of ontology, and then political practice may be much more fruitful. Persons may be able to control their lives, instead of being subjected to another insensitive political system. And with respect to globalization, they will be able to do more than simply adjust to economic policies that are equated with rationality and general improvement.

# Neolib K – Framework – Frontline

#### If we win framework it means the following:

#### 1. Dismiss perms-they have to justify their 1AC world view and can’t sever their reps-best for ground and education because it prevents aff conditionality and debate is an academic activity.

#### 2. Plan is not offense-questions whether the alt increases energy are not relevant-point of stasis is whether the aff perpetuates neoliberal social relations in advocating energy production—if that is bad you reject the aff because the plan responds to a poorly constructed and dangerous model of the world.

#### 3. Discount all their answers-accepting the frame of neoliberalism gears solutions to be watered down or delegitimized

**Faber and McCarthy, Northeastern University Philanthropy and Environmental Justice Research Project, 2003**

(Daniel R Faber Director; Deborah McCarthy Research Associate, College of Charleston Assistant Professor of Sociology and Anthropology. “Neo-Liberalism, Globalization and the Struggle for Ecological Democracy Linking Sustainability and Environmental Justice.” Pg 56-7, ldg)

As we move further into the new millennium, the mainstream US ecology movement is confronting an immense paradox. On the one hand, over the last three decades environmentalists have built one of the more broadly based and politically powerful new social movements in this country's history. As a result, US governmental policies for protecting the environment and human health are among the most stringent in the world. On the other hand, despite having won many important battles, it is becoming increasing apparent that the traditional environmental movement is losing the war for a healthy planet. With the ascendancy of neo-liberalism, globalization and the growing concentration of corporate power over all spheres of life, the ability of the movement to solve the ecological crisis is undermined. While there is no doubt that ecological problems would be much worse without the mainstream environmental movement and current system of regulation, it is also clear that the traditional strategies and policy solutions being employed are proving to be increasingly impaired. Most existing environmental laws are poorly enforced and overly limited in prescription, emphasizing, for instance, ineffectual pollution control measures which aim to limit public exposure to 'tolerable levels' of industrial toxins rather than promo ting pollution prevention measures which prohibit whole families of dangerous pollutants from being produced in the first place. In addition, other problems such as the acceleration of sprawl and the growth in US emissions of greenhouse gases continue to worsen. The US system of environmental regulation may be among the best in the world, but it is grossly inadequate for safeguarding human health and the integrity of nature. Perhaps the most critical factor for explaining the hegemony of neo-liberalism and the growing incapacity of the state to adequately address the ecological crisis is what Robert Putnam has termed the decline in social capital — those social networks and assets that facilitate the education, coordination and cooperation of citizens for mutual benefit (Putnam, 2000). Over the past generation, the social networks that integrate citizens into environmental organizations and other civic institutions have seriously deteriorated in communities across the country. The resulting decline in social capital inhibits genuine citizen participation in the affairs of civil society and engagement in the realm of politics, including the ability to tackle environmental problems in an equitable and effective fashion (Borgos and Douglas, 1996). With interactions that build mutual trust eroded, greater sectors of the populace become increasingly cynical of their ability to collectively effect meaningful ecological and social changes. Instead, a growing number of people retreat into what Jurgen Habermas (1975) terms civil privatism, with an emphasis on personal lifestyle issues such as career advancement, social mobility and conspicuous consumption. When social and environmental problems are confronted, increasingly individualized or 'privatized' solutions become the favoured response. As a result, the various racial, ethnic, class and religious divides in American society become accentuated, as the 'haves' increasingly disregard the needs of the ‘have nots': witness the attack on affirmative action, the social safety net, labour rights and ecological protection in favour of reduced taxes, fiscal conservatism and increasingly harsh punishments for criminal misconduct. Unfortunately, too many mainstream environmental organizations adapt corporate-like organizational models that further inhibit broad-based citizen involvement in environmental problem-solving. For these groups, citizen engagement means simply sending in membership dues, signing a petition and writing the occasional letter to a government official. As stated by William Shutkin (2000, ppl-20), there is a 'tendency for many non-profit environmental organizations to treat members as clients and consumers of services, or volunteers who help the needy, rather than as participants in the evolution of ideas and projects that forge our common life'. In the effort to conduct studies, draft legislation and organize constituencies to support passage of environment-friendly initiatives, the mainstream movement has gravitated toward a greater reliance on law and science conducted by professional experts. The aim of this move towards increased professionalization is to regain legitimacy and expert status in increasingly hostile neo-liberal policy circles. The effect, however, is to reduce internal democratic practices within some environmental organizations and state regulatory agencies. The focus on technical-rational questions, solutions and compromises, rather than issues of political power and democratic decision-making, is causing a decline in public interest and participation in national environmental politics (Faber and O'Connor, 1993)./

# Perm

#### Embracing commons solves:

#### 1. Opens space for movements to converge against the crises of neoliberalism-focusing on the discursive is key-that’s De Angelis.

# Neolib K – Alternative – 2NC/1NR

#### 2. Try or die-only way to create a system not centered on profit.

**Sachs et al., Wuppertal Institute for Climate, Environment and Energy, 2012**

(Wolfgang, “Critique of the Green Economy Toward Social and Environmental Equity”, <http://boell.org/downloads/Critique_of_the_Green_Economy.pdf>, DOA: 6-27-12, ldg)

In all the old industrial countries the times of high economic growth are past. Experts now argue over whether we should expect a slight rise in economic output year on year or zero growth punctuated by upswings and downswings. Yet that takes no account of the green transformation of society and the economy. A strategy of eco-efficiency (“better”), environmental sustainability (“different”) and self-restraint (“less”) has fewer prospects of growth. In a post-growth society the renewable sectors of the economy will need to grow while the fossil ones shrink, but on balance it must be assumed that in the long term growth rates will be negative. How will a non-growing economy work, if everyone has a lower income than before? To this key question, which will define the next few decades, there are broadly speaking two answers – a reactionary one and a progressive one. The reactionary answer involves enduring a period of loss of growth accompanied by increasing inequality, social exclusion and impoverishment. The progressive one sees us investing in a new model of wealth that ensures that everyone has enough, because it is based on a different equilibrium between the economy and society. The progressive answer does not just fall from the sky; we must prepare for it over the forthcoming years and decades. Strengthening society as against the economy needs new types of infrastructure for different ways of thinking. The commons are a fundamental feature of our present reality. People can only survive and thrive if they have access to nature, to family and friends, and to language and culture. While this may seem obvious, it is hard to find a public and political language in which to talk about the commons. If we speak of the economy, the concepts of the market and the state dominate everything else. If we speak of politics, what comes to mind is the polarization of right and left. Hardly anyone mentions the commons – as though nothing of significance exists outside the market and the state. These two concepts are like two communicating tubes: a lot of market on one side and not much state on the other; not much market on one side and a lot of state on the other. Yet historians and anthropologists have long been at pains to point out that exchanging goods via the market or via the state are only two ways in which goods can be distributed – there is a third way: exchange in the community. The first way is governed by the principle of competition and the second by the principle of planning, while in the third the emphasis is on mutuality. In any society the three distributive principles usually mingle, but over the last two centuries something new has happened: the principle of mutuality has steadily lost ground. Since Adam Smith the relationship between the market and the state, between competition and planning, has become the main dispute, while the principle of mutuality has become the big loser. Social groups such as families, relatives, neighborhoods, networks of friends, cooperatives and similar economic forms have been sucked into a vortex of decline from which by turns the market and the state have emerged victorious. In a post-growth society this development must be reversed. Or rather: it must move forwards. The commons are another source of wealth in addition to the market and the state. They form the basis of social communities, especially at four levels: Firstly, at the natural level all humans depend on water, forests, soil, fishing grounds, species diversity, countryside, air and the atmosphere and on the life processes embedded in them. As biological beings they have a right to natural assets, regardless of and with precedence over any private ownership of natural stocks. Secondly, at the social level places such as squares, parks, courtyards and public gardens, as well as post-work leisure, holidays and free time, are essential if social networks are to develop. Thirdly, as far as the cultural level is concerned, it is obvious that language, memory, customs and knowledge are basic to the creation of any material or non-material product. As cultural beings, the spirits and fates of every person ultimately rely on the achievements of others. And finally, fourthly, at the digital level: production and exchange on the Internet work best if access to stored data is not impeded. For free navigation in the virtual world it is important that neither software codes nor the wealth of uploaded documents, sounds and pictures are locked away by excessive property claims. Restoring the strength of the commons requires a different perspective on the economy. What actually is property? And what legitimates the ownership of property? What sounds like a philosophical discussion has practical consequences. If the concept of property does not discriminate clearly between possession and use there is little hope either for the shepherd who lets his sheep graze here one day and there the next, or for the Internet surfer who downloads articles and pictures. And what actually is competition? If competition is understood as “costriving” (and the German word for competition, “Konkurrenz,” has the same Latin root as the English “concur”) rather than as “survival of the fittest,” then small traders and software specialists can breathe again. And what does creating value actually mean? If it means only monetary value created by selling goods and services, then work in the home, neighborhood services, community organizations and peer groups are left out in the cold. And – the most fundamental question of all – what actually is money? If we make no distinction between money as a means of exchange and credit and money as a means of enrichment and speculation, the whole economy is listing dangerously – in nautical terms it is a disaster waiting to happen. Looking at the economy from a different angle reveals important aspects that could be relevant to a no-growth economy. Alongside the formal economy there is a relational economy that is concerned not with material things but with relationships between people. The ambit of the relational economy is wide and can range from traditional associations such as sports clubs and church communities, together with businesses of the classical type such as shops and repair services, to post-modern manifestations such as car-sharing schemes and community solar energy projects. Different forms of commitment can arise: friendships, self-help groups and neighborhood services as well as welfare organizations, local businesses and Internet services. Forms of the relational economy can be found in different sectors: relating to food, the care of the sick and elderly, service provision and everyday needs, and in sports and entertainment. At the core is an economy that is built on social relationships, a “care economy.” It cares for children, young people, the sick and the elderly. It brings together parents, educators and carers of all types. Of course it also demonstrates the difficulties that a relational economy has to contend with: care work, family relationships, local communities and private organizations will need to be financially and structurally reorganized. This reorganization must also extend to relationships between the genders if the inherited gender-based division of labor that is predicated on gender hierarchy is not to become even more firmly entrenched. The “care economy,” and with it the whole concept of the relational economy, will be derailed if men and women do not participate equally. Caring must undergo a political and social revaluation. In the process, paid and unpaid work must be redistributed – not just between the genders, but primarily so. Moreover, the relational economy appeals to different motives and norms than the market and the state. Competition and achievement, routine and loyalty certainly occur and can be a component of the social commons, but they can never replace voluntary action and selforganization, cooperation and enterprise. Whether in the development of Wikipedia or of urban community gardens or in the running of old people’s clubs and nursery schools – the virtue of cooperation is writ large. Cooperation, with all the attendant difficulties, is held in higher regard than competition, shared curiosity is valued more than hoarding egotism. Things are more successful if they are done with passion, commitment and a sense of responsibility – this is an old lesson that classical business administration has been slow to learn. How can an economy function without growing? This is a big question that cannot be answered without considering the hidden dimensions of wealth – and in particular of the care economy. One of these dimensions is the social commons. Although private wealth is the most frequently highlighted aspect of wealth, all the variants of community wealth are just as important. Moreover, they harbor the opportunity of creating forms of a “distributed economy” based on the model of distributed energy production – in other words, forms of local production that are linked, globally if necessary, via the Internet. Above all, though, it has become possible to imagine a form of wealth with less money. Because in the social commons services are not provided for monetary reasons, but out of a sense of community spirit, interest or solidarity, needs can be met with a lesser investment of money. For example, just as Wikipedia would be unaffordable if all the authors and editors had to be paid a fee, older people in a housing project provide caring services for each other that could never be paid for from public care budgets. The reinvention of the commons is therefore vital to the creation of an economic order for the 21st century that has been freed from the dictate of growth.

# Neolib K – Alternative – 2NC/1NR

#### 3. Stops the spread of enclosures and creates autonomy against corporate golobaization.

**De Angelis, East London political economy professor, 2004**

(Massimo, “Separating the Doing and the Deed: Capital and the Continuous Character of Enclosures”, Historical Materialism; 2004, Vol. 12 Issue 2, p57-87, ebsco, ldg)

In the context of contemporary dynamics, the many types of ‘new enclosures’ 46 are deﬁned through both of these two processes of identiﬁcation. Enclosures are identiﬁed both by processes of commodiﬁcation and by processes of decommodiﬁcation; by strategies that go under the name, for example, of ‘privatisation’; or by class strategies that roll enclosures back through practices that produce commons and reinvent communities. In the ﬁrst case, they include attacks on conditions of life by a World Bank-funded dam in India threatening hundred of thousands of farming communities; cuts in social spending to pay for servicing international debt in a country of the global South; cuts in social expenditures in the UK threatening hundreds of thousands of families. In the second case, as in St George’s Hill during the English Civil War, 47 or currently in Brazil in the waves of land occupations, 48 or in the de facto mass illegal bypassing of intellectual property rights in music and software production and the establishment of ‘creative commons’, it is possible to identify enclosures as an external limit, posed by capital, to the production of commons. It is this barrier that political and social movements need to overcome through the production of commons, and often this production is the result of practices of civil disobedience and direct action, rather than of traditional party politics. Also, it is clear that these productions of commons, in the context in which capital aims at pervading the entire social ﬁeld, are at the same time struggles against enclosures. The awareness and de facto identiﬁcation of enclosures thus arises either because the production of commons problematises existing established property rights (as past enclosures), or because the struggles to defend commons established in the past problematise the threat of new enclosures attempted by states. In other words, the extent to which we are aware of enclosures is the extent to which we are confronted by them. In all other social interactions still rooted in commons of different types (take, for example, language), in commons that are not immediately threatened by enclosures, we live our lives undisturbed. Here, we are only preoccupied by the question of how we relate to each other within these commons (say, how do we speak to each other), and not whether the ‘what’ that constitutes the material basis of this ‘how’ is a common or not. We take that for granted. As we have seen, there is a vast critical literature on processes of privatisation, marketisation, cuts in entitlements both North and South, effects of structural adjustment policies, biopiracy, intellectual property rights, resource privatisation, and so on. However, not much effort has been devoted to pulling together these and other types of enclosures into a coherent whole, rooted in a critique of capital. The broad picture which I present derives from an understanding of the role of enclosure from a capitalist-systemic point of view, that is from the role which enclosures play in the accumulation of surplus-value by capital (the M-C-M’ process). From this perspective, all these different types of enclosures, and the consequent enclosure strategies, share a common character: the forcible separation of people from whatever access to social wealth they have which is not mediated by competitive markets and money as capital. Where such access exists, it empowers people in that it gives them a degree of autonomy and independence from the corporate sharks of the world economy and from competitive market relations. New enclosures thus are directed towards the fragmentation and destruction of ‘commons’, that is, social spheres of life whose main characteristic is to provide various degrees of protection from the market.

# Neolib K – Alternative – 2NC/1NR

#### 4. Rejecting market competition is an act of economic imagination that can create real alternatives within the existing economy

**White et al., Sheffield Hallam University economic geography senior lecturer, 2012**

(Richard, Escaping Capitalist Hegemony: Rereading Western Economies in The Accumulation of Freedom, pg 131-2, ldg)

The American anarchist Howard Ehrlich argued, "We must act as if the future is today." What we have hoped to demonstrate here is that non‑capitalist spaces are present and evident in contemporary societies. We do not need to imagine and create from scratch new economic alternatives that will successfully confront the capitalist hegemony thesis, or more properly the capitalist hegemony myth. Rather than capitalism being the all powerful, all conquering, economic juggernaut, the greater truth is that the "other" non‑capitalist spaces have grown in proportion relative in size to the capitalism realm. This should give many of us great comfort and hope in moving forward purposefully for, as Chomsky observed: "[a]lternatives have to be constructed within the existing economy, and within the minds of working people and communities."' In this regard, the roots of the heterodox economic futures that we desire do exist in the present. Far from shutting down future economic possibilities, a more accurate reading of "the economic" (which decenters capitalism), coupled with the global crisis that capitalism finds itself in, should give us additional courage and resolve to unleash our economic imaginations, embrace the challenge of creating "fully engaged" economies. These must also take greater account of the disastrous social and environmental costs of capitalism and its inherent ethic of competition. As Kropotkin wrote: Don't compete!‑competition is always injurious to the species, and you have plenty of resources to avoid it! Therefore combine‑practice mutual aid! That is the surest means for giving to each and all to the greatest safety, the best guarantee of existence and progress, bodily, intellectual, and moral ....That is what Nature teaches us; and that is what all those animals which have attained the highest position in the respective classes have done. That is also what man [ski‑the most primitive man‑has been doing; and that is why man has reached the position upon which we stand now." A more detailed and considered discussion of the futures of work, however, is beyond the scope of this chapter. What we have hoped to demonstrate is that in reimagining the economic, and recognizing and valuing the non‑capitalist economic practices that are already here, we might spark renewed enthusiasm, optimism, insight, and critical discussion within and among anarchist communities. The ambition here is similar to that of Gibson‑Graham, in arguing that: The objective is not to produce a finished and coherent template that maps the economy "as it really is" and presents... a ready made "alternative economy." Rather, our hope is to disarm and dislocate the naturalized dominance of the capitalist economy and make a space for new economic becomings‑ones that we will need to work to produce. If we can recognize a diverse economy, we can begin to imagine and create diverse organizations and practices as powerful constituents of an enlivened noncapitalist policies of place.

#### 1. All links are disads to the perm---they shouldn’t be able to sever their 1AC justifications---that’s the framework debate---voter for negative ground.

#### 2. Alt is competitive-they think energy is merely a societal input that can be used for consumptive purposes which obfuscates broader questions of neoliberal social relations – that’s Byrne Impossible for them to embrace commons because it is the opposite of their market based approach

#### Nuclear production locks in production-ism through obsession with finance, competitiveness and technological solutions

**Maciejewska et al., Wroclaw Sociology and Faculty of Social Sciences institute, 2011**

(Malgorzata, “Lack of power or lack of democracy: the case of the projected nuclear power plant in Poland”, Economic and Environmental Studies, 11.3, project muse, ldg)

The mainstream discourse on nuclear power rarely takes up the question of how the global energy industry is organized. In the modern economy the production of energy around the world, which is supposed to be a kind of public good and to guarantee sustainable development, is planned and arranged under free market conditions. As a part of the global chain of extraction, production and trading, it is subordinated to the neoliberal logic on terms of which the society and economy is governed as a business enterprise with the logic of maximum interest and minimum loss. This imposes on different actors (from the international corporations to individual households) the discipline of competitiveness and profitability, resulting in the growth of existing inequalities as ‘the invisible hand’ of the free market economy legitimizes those subjects which are already in power. The modern global economy is based on irrational production and social inequalities where one can observe the processes of work intensification and the cheapening of labor. The markets are dominated by the unproductive virtual economy (See Peterson, 2002) where the major players are the financial institutions which, by means of sophisticated financial tools, buy and sell virtual products (currencies, stocks, insurances, debts and its derivatives). In effect, the major actors in the capitalist economy are the international investors who have the capability of financial liquidity, and operate with those sophisticated financial tools on the global stock market. Even when they lose those capacities because of indebtedness, the states and international organizations seem often to be willing to repair the damage by transferring the taxes paid by citizens. (This is actually happening now, during the financial crisis, when southern and western European countries are subjected to shock therapy under which governments introduce austerity measures.) The praxis of nuclear power producers and the discourse which legitimizes it is therefore reduced to one goal – increasing financial revenues. The Polish plan to build the atomic power plant seems to be another element of the competitiveness strategy. In the authorities’ mind set it could put Poland into the position of more a competitive, more dynamic economy, as expected by the European Union and international organizations such as the International Monetary Fund or the World Bank. The welfare of Poland’s or Niger’s society does not fit into that picture. The nuclear establishment does not take into account the most important aspect of sustainable development: the overall reduction of energy consumption and therefore of energy production. Such a policy could bring a wide range of profits to the societies, the ecosystem, as well as the economy. On the contrary, the increase of power production and power use is one of the core concepts of pro-atomic discourse. This dogmatic belief draws the ideological line indicated at the beginning: the question of energy use and the ideas for solving this problem are seen only as a matter of technological challenges and the amount of financial and material means which have to be invested in them, but not as an effort to re-organize and restructure the modern economy.

# Neolib K – Link – Nuclear Power – 2NC/1NR

#### Their epistemology is bankrupt

**Maciejewska et al., Wroclaw Sociology and Faculty of Social Sciences institute, 2011**

(Malgorzata, “Lack of power or lack of democracy: the case of the projected nuclear power plant in Poland”, Economic and Environmental Studies, 11.3, project muse, ldg)

Significantly, the voices of resistance towards nuclear energy (defined as 'the enemy') are consistently constructed as ‘irrational’ and ‘emotional’ (2010:20). “The campaign’s target should be therefore composed of pro-ecological groups excluding its radical wing – the radical fanatics for whom the resistance itself is an essential justification” (2010:10). According to the document, the opponents, especially from the ecological movements, are named ‘radical fanatics’ who cannot be reached by means of rational arguments, therefore are not the campaign’s target: Thus, the document neglects the whole spectrum of the opponents’ argumentation. The groups suitable for the campaign’s efforts are not the ones that: “have the orthodox approach, but the ones which emphasize the cleanness of atomic energy production” (2010:9). On top of this, the opinions which disagree with the safety of nuclear power plants are neglected and depicted simply as a misjudgment. The Concept’ segregates its targets: excluding the ‘ideological opponents’ (the ecologists), it is meant to make its strongest influence on the groups potentially reluctant to the idea: women, young people, uneducated, peasants and small local communities.Once defined as incompetent, superstitious and susceptible to manipulation, their voice is meant to be kept down in the debate, by giving them information and education. Explicitly, the document describes those groups as “societies easily manipulated by the charismatic leaders and nuclear power antagonist and theirs demagogic thesis” and anti-nuclear standpoints are described as “psychosis that is a mixture of fear, panic and horror” (2010:23). What is kept out of view is that the groups which have limited access to information should constitute the main subject of nuclear propaganda (assuming that access to knowledge is also access to power: they are seen as disempowered and subordinated). The lack of objectivity and neutrality of the public institutions involved in the nuclear campaign is also visible in granting procedures. Compared to other scientific institutions, the National Atomic Energy Agency has been one of the largest recipients of state support. In 2010 and 2011, it received 100 million PLN (about 25 million EUR) from the public budget. Simultaneously, the state subsidies for research projects in natural and social science amounted to 150 million PLN (about 38 million EUR) (Ministry of Finance 2011a, 2011b). The deficit of democracy which emerges from the pro-nuclear discourse also manifests itself in the lack of recognition for historical movements of resistance against atomic power, which are dismissed as an aberration. The arguments of nuclear power plant’s safety, efficiency and profitability are the core legitimization for this exclusion. The importance of the ecological movements existing in the 1980s and social mobilization against nuclear energy at that time is neglected and devalued within the current pro-atomic discourse. During the Round Table debates in 1989, one of major postulates posed by the Solidarity movement concerned the need for social deliberation on the development of nuclear technology in Poland, which was constantly ignored by the government (at that time, as it is now, the issue of atomic power production evoked a lot of social objection) (Guła and Popczyk, 2010). The case of the recent explosions in the Fukushima Dai-Ichi power plant have recalled the same mechanism of negation. The independent media brought back the issue of ecological protests in Japan during the construction process of the first atomic power plant, but the Polish mass-media remained silent about it. As one of the Japanese anti-nuclear activist Yoko Akimoto said recently: Members [of anti-nuclear movements] struggled against the construction of nuclear power plants, identifying the danger of nuclear power plants in this earthquake-prone country. At that time, the government expropriated fishing rights from the fishery cooperative or local community to build the nuclear power plants. The government forcibly destroyed people’s life on fishing grounds to build those plants, saying with confidence that the nuclear power plant was safe (Akimoto, 2010). The ecological movement, past and present, is deprived of the power to represent the civil society and defined as a public enemy that produces extra (and unnecessary) economic and political costs. On the day of the first explosion in the Fukushima power plant, the polish Prime Minister, Donald Tusk, said: The Japanese example shows how safe the nuclear power plants are, having the ability to weather even such terrible natural catastrophe. We are now facing one of the greatest earthquakes in history; just imagine what would have happen with a traditional power plant, how it would have polluted the environment during such a catastrophe (Tusk, 2011). This strategy of ‘damage control’ shows how even the unquestionable facts can be intercepted and used to support the arguments of pro-atomic discourse. The lack of acknowledgment for the history of nuclear industry and the history of resistance against the consequences of such technology, coupled with rear reflection on the future of nuclear power production is significant for the dominant discourse on nuclear energy. The possibility of running out of the uranium supplies and the question of the safety of shutting down the reactors as well as storing the radioactive waste, is now named by the ecologists as the problem of future generations – but still it is invisible for the present authorities.

# Impacts

#### Neoliberalism causes social alienation from nature and infinite consumption which makes environmental destruction and extinction inevitable – also endlessly commodities all human life which means their impacts are non-unique – that’s Byrne

#### Neoliberalism commodifies environmental destruction-means it can’t self-correct

**Foster et al., Oregon sociology professor, 2010**

(John, The Ecological Rift: Capitalism’s War on the Earth, pg 69-72, ldg)

A peculiarity of capitalism, brought out by the Lauderdale Paradox, is that it feeds on scarcity. Hence, nothing is more dangerous to capitalism as a system than abundance. Waste and destruction are therefore rational for the system. Although it is often supposed that increasing environmental costs will restrict economic growth, such costs continue to be externalized under capitalism on nature (and society) as a whole. This perversely provides new prospects for private profits through the selective commodification of parts of nature (public wealth. All of this points to the fact that there is no real feedback mechanism, as commonly supposed, from rising ecological costs to economic crisis, that can be counted on to check capitalism's destruction of the biospheric conditions of civilization and life itself. By the perverse logic of the system, whole new industries and markets aimed profiting on planetary destruction, such as the waste management industry and carbon trading, are being opened up. These new markets are justified as offering partial, ad hoc "solutions" to the problems generated nonstop by capital's laws of motion.38 The growth of natural scarcity is seen as a golden opportunity which to further privatize the world's commons. This tragedy of privatization of the commons only accelerates the destruction of the natural environment, while enlarging the system that weighs upon it. This is best illustrated by the rapid privatization of fresh water, which is now seen as a new mega-market for global accumulation. The drying up and contamination of fresh water diminishes public wealth, creating investment opportunities for capital, while profits made from selling increasingly scarce water are recorded as contributions to income and riches. It is not surprising, therefore, that the UN Commission on Sustainable Development proposed, at a 1998 conference in Paris, that governments should turn to "large multinational corporations" in addressing issues of water scarcity, establishing "open markets" in water rights. Gerard Mestrallet, CEO of the global water giant Suez, has openly pronounced: "Water is an efficient product. It is a product which normally would be free, and our job is to sell it. But it is a product which is absolutely necessary for life." He further remarked: "Where else [other than in the monopolization of increasingly scarce water resources for private gain] can you find a business that's totally international, where the prices and volumes, unlike steel, rarely go down?"39 Not only water offers new opportunities for profiting on scarcity. This is also the case with respect to fuel and food. Growing fuel shortages, as world oil demand has outrun supply—with peak oil approaching—has led to increases in the prices of fossil fuels and energy in general, and to a global shift in agriculture from food crops to fuel crops. This has generated a boom in the agrofuel market (expedited by governments on the grounds of "national security" concerns). The result has been greater food scarcities, inducing an upward spiral in food prices and the spiking of world hunger. Speculators have seen this as an opportunity for getting richer quicker through the monopolization of land and primary commodity resources.40 Similar issues arise with respect to carbon-trading schemes, ostensibly aimed at promoting profits while reducing carbon emissions. Such schemes continue to be advanced even though experiments in this respect have thus far failed to reduce emissions. Here, the expansion of capital trumps actual public interest in protecting the vital conditions of life. At all times, ruling-class circles actively work to prevent radical structural change in this as in other areas, since any substantial transformation in social-environmental relations would mean challenging the treadmill of production and launching an ecological-cultural revolution. Indeed, from the standpoint of capital accumulation, global warming and desertification are blessings in disguise, increasing the prospects of expanding private riches. We are thus driven back to Lauderdale's question: "What opinion," he asked, "would be entertained of the understanding of a man, who, as the means of increasing the wealth of... a country should propose to create a scarcity of water, the abundance of which was deservedly considered one of the greatest blessings incident to the community? It is certain, however, that such a projector would, by this means, succeed in increasing the mass of individual riches."41 Numerous ecological critics have, of course, tried to address the contradictions associated with the devaluation of nature by designing new green accounting systems that would include losses of "natural capital."42 Although such attempts are important in bringing out the irrationality of the system, they run into the harsh reality that the current system of national accounts does accurately reflect capitalist realities of the non-valuation/undervaluation of natural agents (including human labor power). To alter this, it is necessary to transcend the system. The dominant form of valuation in our age of global ecological crisis is a true reflection of capitalism's mode of social and environmental degradation—causing it to profit on the destruction of the planet. In Marx's critique, value was conceived of as an alienated form of wealth.43 Real wealth came from nature and labor power and was associated with the fulfillment of genuine human needs. Indeed, "it would be wrong," Marx wrote, "to say that labour which produces use values is the only source of the wealth produced by it, that is of mater, wealth Use-value always comprises a natural element... Labour is a natural condition of human existence, a condition of material interchange [metabolism] between man and nature." From this slant point, Lauderdale's paradox was not a mere enigma of economic analysis but rather the supreme contradiction of a system that, as Marx stressed, developed only by "simultaneously undermining the origin sources of all wealth—the soil and the worker."44

#### 2. Math unequivocally goes NEG.

**Naess, Aalborg Urban Planning professor, 2006**

(Peter, “Unsustainable Growth, Unsustainable Capitalism”, Journal of Critical Realism, 5.2, ebsco, ldg)

Those who believe that economic growth can be de-coupled from environmental loads and resource consumption will probably answer that we must (and will) become even more proﬁcient in the art of dematerialisation, i.e. produce more and more while continually decreasing the resource input and environmental impacts per unit produced. But as growth continues over a long time span, quite dramatic reduction factors will be needed in order to prevent resource consumption and environmental load from increasing. With a growth rate of three and a half per cent per year over a period of 100 years, obtaining a halving of the annual resource consumption and environmental load would require dematerialisation down to 1.6 per cent of the present level, that is, by a factor of 62. If expected global population growth is also taken into consideration, along with the even higher growth rates recommended by the World Commission in developing countries in order to raise their standard of living, then the necessary dematerialisation factor in industrial countries is even higher, probably over 100. And notice that this reduction factor must be the average for all sectors— both where the potential for dematerialisation is high and in sectors where a disconnection of growth from environmental load is diﬃcult. Even with a more moderate growth rate, for example 2.1% per year, which is more similar to the growth actually experienced in Western European countries in recent years, the world’s total production would increase by a factor of 8 after 100 years, 64 after 200 years, and 32,858 after 500 years. If the environmental load is to be half the present level, an average dematerialisation factor of more than 65,000 would be required by the middle of this millennium! The absurdity of these scenarios illustrates how untenable it is to believe that growth in consumption and production can continue inﬁnitely without running into ecological limits. The dogma of the possibility of decoupling growth in production and consumption from exploitation of natural resources and environmental degradation is therefore not valid, at least not in a long-term perspective. The belief that production and consumption can be multiplied again and again out of nothing is the alchemy of neoclassical economics.

#### Neolbieralism produces crises, securitizes them and militarily lashes out against them-this cycle triggers every impact and causes extinction.

**Mosaddeq, Sussex University IR professor, 2010**

(Nafeez, “Globalizing Insecurity: The Convergence of Interdependent Ecological, Energy, and Economic Crises”, 7-20, <http://yalejournal.org/2010/07/globalizing-insecurity-the-convergence-of-interdependent-ecological-energy-and-economic-crises/>, DOA: 6-29-12, ldg)

The logic of ‘growth’ – as currently defined – is driving the depletion of hydrocarbon and other natural resources at unprecedented, and unsustainable, rates, and thereby accelerating human-interference with the earth’s climate. Both climate change and energy crises are detrimentally impacting our ability to sustain global food production. Water shortages and hotter weather are destroying the viability of agriculture, while predicted fuel shortages are set to undermine agribusiness which is heavily dependent on fossil fuels. The increasing inability to meet consumer demand for food is also linked to the industrial over-exploitation of the soil, as well as a fundamentally flawed international system of food distribution. Finally, the world economy remains in bad health, generating widening North-South inequalities, and fuelling unsustainable ‘virtual’ growth trajectories in the North. The ‘Washington Consensus’ has proven to be intimately bound up with the destruction of the environment, the exhaustion of the soil, the unsustainable depletion of resources and raw materials, and the unrestrained de-balancing of the Earth’s complexly interdependent ecosystems. If anything, this signifies that we are in era of civilizational transition to a new post-carbon era. Yet what social form we transition to, remains our collective choice. Currently, conventional ‘securitization’ of these global crises results in their conceptualization as “threat-multipliers” of traditional security issues such as “political instability around the world, the collapse of governments and the creation of terrorist safe havens.” By implication, climate change will serve to amplify the threat of international terrorism, particularly in regions with large populations and scarce resources.[xlvi] For instance, a U.S. Department of Defence and Department of the Army report, 2008 Army Modernization Strategy, forecasts the future of international conflict up to 2050: “We have entered an era of persistent conflict... a security environment much more ambiguous and unpredictable than that faced during the Cold War... We face a potential return to traditional security threats posed by emerging near-peers as we compete globally for depleting natural resources and overseas markets.” The report then highlights the danger of “resource competition induced by growing populations and expanding economies,” particularly due to a projected “youth bulge” in the South, which “will consume ever increasing amounts of food, water and energy.” Climate change will “compound” the destabilization of the South through humanitarian crises, population migrations and other complex emergencies.[xlvii] ‘Securitizing’ global crises, then, leads to strategies of militarization designed to boost an individual state’s resilience to crisis through intensification of control mechanisms. On the other hand, we have strategies of international cooperation to establish new global governance regimes by which states can develop treaties and agreements to encourage mitigating action. Unfortunately, as has become painfully clear in Kyoto and more recently in Copenhagen, while the first set of ‘securitization’ strategies proceeds apace, the second set of cooperative strategies continues to result in dismal failure, with states unable to agree on the scale of the crises concerned, let alone the policies required to address them. In some ways, each of these strategies can be broadly associated with the two predominant approaches to International Relations theory, namely neorealism and neoliberalism. Neorealism understands interstate competition, rivalry and warfare as inevitable functions of states’ uncertainty about their own survival, arising from the anarchic structure of the international system. Gains for one state are losses for another, and each state’s attempt to maximize its power relative to all other states is simply a reflection of its rational pursuit of its own security. The upshot, of course, is the normalization of political violence in the international system, including practices such as over-exploitation of energy and the environment, as a ‘rational’ strategy – even though this ultimately amplifies global systemic insecurity. Inability to cooperate internationally and for mutual benefit is thus seen as an inevitable outcome of the simple, axiomatic existence of multiple states. The problem is that neorealism cannot explain in the first place the complex interdependence or worsening of global crises. Unable to situate these crises in the context of an international system that is not simply a set of states, but a transnational global structure based on a specific exploitative relationship with the natural world, neorealism can only theorize global crises as ‘new issue areas’ appended to existing security agendas.[xlviii] Yet, by the very act of ‘securitizing’ global crises, neorealism renders itself impotent to prevent or mitigate them by addressing their root structural causes. In effect, despite its emphasis on the reasons why states seek security, neorealism’s approach to issues like climate change actually guarantees greater insecurity by promoting policies which frame these issues purely as amplifiers of threats. Neorealism thus entirely negates its own theoretical and normative value. For if ‘security’ is the fundamental driver of state foreign policies, then why are states chronically incapable of effectively ameliorating the global systemic amplifiers of ‘insecurity’? Although neoliberalism shares neorealism’s assumptions about the centrality of the state as a rational actor in the international system, it differs fundamentally in the notion that gains for one state do not automatically imply losses for another. As such, states are able to form cooperative, interdependent relationships conducive to mutual power gains, which do not necessarily generate tensions or conflict. While neoliberalism therefore encourages international negotiations and global governance mechanisms for the resolution of global crises, it implicitly accepts the contemporary social, political and economic organization of the international system as an unquestionable ‘given’ that cannot be subject to debate or reform. The focus, then, is on developing the most optimal ways of exploiting the natural world to the maximal extent, and neglected is the very role of global political economic structures (such as ridiculously deregulated markets) in both generating global crises and inhibiting effective means for their amelioration. Arguably, neoliberalism has difficulty viewing the natural world in anything other than a rationalist, instrumentalist fashion, legitimizing the over-exploitation of natural resources without limits, and inadvertently subordinating ecological, energy, food and human security to the competitive pressures of private sector profit-maximization.[xlix] Both theoretical approaches focus on trying to understand different aspects of inter-state behaviour – conflictual and cooperative respectively – but each lacks the capacity to address the relationship of the inter-state system itself to the natural world as a key analytical category for understanding the acceleration of global crises. In doing so, they are unable to acknowledge the profound irrationality of collective state behaviour, which systematically erodes this relationship, globalizing insecurity on a massive scale – in the very process of seeking security. Indeed, by reducing this destructive state behaviour to a function of instrumental reason, both approaches rationalize the deeply irrational collective human actions that are destroying the very conditions of our existence. For our civilization to begin tackling these crises effectively, we need to fundamentally re-orient our understanding of the conditions and subjects of security, based on a new perspective which re-integrates human life as interdependent with, and inextricably embedded in, its natural environment.[l] This requires a holistic vision of human and ecological security, which recognizes that significant global structural policy reforms are the only means to protect human life, national survival, and civilizational continuity into the 21st century. That is not to belittle the urgent task of adaptation, but to recognize that we will save more lives and treasure if we act preventively by re-thinking the efficacy of our current way of life.

#### Globalization causes war-exacerbates all the proximate causes.

**Staples, International Network on Disarmament and Globalization chair, 2000**

(Steven, “The relationship between globalization and militarism”, Social Justice, 27.4, proquest, ldg)

Economic inequality is growing; more conflict and civil wars are emerging. It is important to see a connection between these two situations. Proponents of global economic integration argue that globalization promotes peace and economic development of the Third World. They assert that "all boats rise with the tide" when investors and corporations make higher profits. However, there is precious little evidence that this is true and substantial evidence of the opposite. The United Nation's Human Development Report (U.N. Development Programme, 1999: 3) noted that globalization is creating new threats to human security. Economic inequality between Northern and Southern nations has worsened, not improved. There are more wars being fought today -- mostly in the Third World -- than there were during the Cold War. Most are not wars between countries, but are civil wars where the majority of deaths are civilians, not soldiers. The mainstream media frequently oversimplify the causes of these wars, with claims they are rooted in religious or ethnic differences. A closer inspection reveals that the underlying source of such conflicts is economic in nature. Financial instability, economic inequality, competition for resources, and environmental degradation -- all root causes of war -- are exacerbated by globalization. The Asian financial meltdown of 1997 to 1999 involved a terrible human cost. The economies of Thailand, South Korea, and Indonesia crumbled in the crisis. These countries, previously held up by neoliberal economists as the darlings of globalization, were reduced to riots and financial ruin. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) stepped in to rescue foreign investors and impose austerity programs that opened the way for an invasion by foreign corporations that bought up assets devalued by capital flight and threw millions of people out of work. Political upheaval and conflict ensued, costing thousands of lives. Meanwhile, other countries watched as their neighbors suffered the consequences of greater global integration. In India, citizens faced corporate recolonization, which spawned a nationalistic political movement. Part of the political program was the development of nuclear weapons -- seen by many as the internationally accepted currency of power. Nuclear tests have put an already conflict-ridden region on the brink of nuclear war. 2. Globalization Fuels the Means to Wage War The world economic system promotes military economies over civilian economies, pushing national economic policies toward military spending. The World Trade Organization (WTO), one of the main instruments of globalization, is largely based on the premise that the only legitimate role for a government is to provide for a military to protect the interests of the country and a police force to ensure order within. The WTO attacks governments' social and environmental policies that reduce corporate profits, and it has succeeded in having national laws that protect the environment struck down. Yet the WTO gives exemplary protection to government actions that develop, arm, and deploy armed forces and supply a military establishment. Article XXI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) allows governments free reign for actions taken in the interest of national security. For example, in 1999 a WTO trade panel ruled against a Canadian government program that provided subsidies to aerospace and defense corporations for the production of civilian aircraft. Within weeks, the Canadian military announced a new $30 million subsidy program for the same Canadian corporations, but this time the money was for production of new weapons (Canadian Press, 1999). In this case, the government was forced down the path of a military economy. Contrast this WTO ruling with the billions of dollars the Pentagon gives to American weapons corporations for developing and producing military aircraft. The $309-billion U.S. military budget dwarfs the budgets of all its potential enemies combined, and with the collapse of the Soviet Union the U.S. faces no imminent military challengers. This large budget is, for all practical purposes, a corporate subsidy. Because the corporations involved happen to be building weapons, the subsidy is protected under GATT's Article XXI. The use of military spending to develop a country's industrial and economic base has not been lost on Third World countries. Though struggling to lift itself from apartheid-era poverty and accompanying social problems, South Africa is spending billions of dollars on aircraft, warships, and even submarines in an effort to develop its economy. South Africa stipulated that the arms it buys must be partially manufactured in South Africa. Finance Minister Trevor Manuel explained that the increase in military spending would allow "the National Defence Force to upgrade equipment, while providing a substantial boost to South African industry, foreign investment, and exports" (Engelbrecht, 1999). South Africa's performance requirements would be wide open to WTO challenges if they were for building schools, hospitals, transportation infrastructure, or virtually anything except weapons. South Africa is about to make the same mistake Northern industrialized countries made: it is creating new military projects that will become dependent on perpetual government funding, drawing money away from essential social programs. When the current weapons orders have been filled and government funding dries up, weapons corporations will have to find new customers to maintain current job levels, driving the arms trade and potentially causing a whole new arms race in the region. The Military-Corporate Complex Since the end of the Cold War, President Eisenhower's 1960s-era military-industrial complex has been fundamentally challenged by globalization. Globalization has weakened the powers of the nation-state, while freeing corporations to move profits and operations across national boundaries. Defense/military contractors, once considered part of the national industrial base and regulated and nurtured as such, are becoming detached from the nation-state and are able to pursue their interests independently. Globalization and the transnationalization of defense/military corporations have replaced the military-industrial complex of the Cold War economy with a military-corporate complex of the new global economy. This is based upon the dominance of corporate interests over those of the state. The weakened state is no longer able to reign in weapons corporations and is trapped increasingly by corporate interests: greater military spending, state subsidies, and a liberalization of the arms trade. Increased military production and the proliferation of weaponry take place without considering the costs of militarization to international diplomacy and peace. In many industrialized nations, government military spending has increased since the end of the Cold War. Lockheed Martin, Boeing, BAe Systems (formerly British Aerospace), Raytheon, Thomson-CSF, and DaimlerChrysler Aerospace are all part of the military-corporate complex. Formerly national in orientation, these corporations have become transnational, with enormous revenues and tremendous economic and political power. Boeing alone has global sales of over $50 billion and has swallowed up several competitors to become the world's largest maker of military aircraft, including advanced fighters, bombers, helicopters, and missiles. Boeing is the largest U.S. exporter, with customers in 145 countries, employees in more than 60 countries, and operations in 27 U.S. states. Worldwide, over 200,000 people receive paychecks from Boeing. Weapons corporations on both sides of the Atlantic have been merging at an unprecedented rate in recent years. In the U.S., Boeing has merged with McDonnell Douglas, Hughes Helicopters, and Rockwell International; Lockheed with Martin Marietta and General Dynamics; Northrop with Grumman and Westinghouse; and Raytheon with Hughes Aerospace & Defense and Texas Instruments Defense. In Europe, British Aerospace has taken over GEC Marconi, and France's Aerospatiale Matra has merged with Germany's DaimlerChrysler Aerospace and Spain's CASA. Weapons corporations are merging to compete more forcefully for a dominant share of the lucrative but highly competitive global arms market. In 1998, arms imports amounted to $22 billion, with Third World countries accounting for over half of this market. Until the late 1990s, transatlantic mergers of defense/military contractors had been prohibited by governments due to national security concerns. In 1999, however, the Pentagon admitted that U.S. and European mergers were inevitable and accorded national treatment to BAe Systems, allowing it to be awarded military contracts as if it were an American corporation. These mergers produce ever-larger and more powerful weapons-producing corporations. These newly merged corporations are able to greatly influence, even dictate, government defense and military policy. Government regulations have been weakened or removed altogether. For example, export controls designed to prevent weapons from being sold to countries at war or to countries that violate human rights are narrowly interpreted so that they do not interfere with corporate profits. Foreign embassies and trade missions abroad are used to aid arms sales. 3. The Threat of Military Force Is Used to Protect Corporate Interests According to New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman, "the hidden hand of the market will never work without a hidden fist. McDonald's cannot flourish without McDonnell Douglas, the builder of the F-15. And the hidden fist that keeps the world safe for Silicon Valley's technologies is called the United States Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps" (Friedman, 1999). Friedman illuminates the strategic relationship that exists between corporations and militaries. As globalization extends the reach of corporate interests around the world, a matching military capacity must be deployed to protect those interests. This is the underlying reason the U.S. military maintains the capacity to wage two major wars in different regions of the world simultaneously. There is nothing new about Friedman's "hidden fist." Military supremacy has always been a prerequisite for economic integration into a sphere of influence or an empire. One can see this in the settling of the New World, when the network of military forts and outposts suppressed First Nations peoples and opened North America for settlers, prospectors, and industry barons. Outer space is the next frontier to be made safe for corporations, according to U.S. military strategists. In Vision for 2020, the U.S. Space Command revealed that the "U.S. Space Command [is] dominating the space dimensions of military operations to protect U.S. interests and investment" (United States Space Command, 1997). Conclusion Globalization is driving a global war economy and creating the conditions for tremendous loss of human life. Many writers and researchers have documented the decline in human rights, social justice, environmental standards, and democracy caused by globalization. The inevitable outcome of globalization will be more wars -- especially in the Third World where globalization has its harshest effects. Meanwhile, the elites of the industrialized world are confident that the global economy will continue to provide them with wealth created from the resources and labor of the Third World. Their technologically advanced militaries will protect them and their investments, insulating them from the violent effects of globalization.

#### Causes social invisibility that causes extinction – produces backgrounds of structural violence that makes conflict and environmental collapse inevitable

**Szentes, Corvinus University professor emeritus, 2008**

(Tamas, “Globalisation and prospects of the world society”, <http://www.eadi.org/fileadmin/Documents/Events/exco/Glob.___prospects_-_jav..pdf>, DOA: 7-4-12, ldg)

It’ s a common place that human society can survive and develop only in a lasting real peace. Without peace countries cannot develop. Although since 1945 there has been no world war, but • numerous local wars took place, • terrorism has spread all over the world, undermining security even in the most developed and powerful countries, • arms race and militarisation have not ended with the collapse of the Soviet bloc, but escalated and continued, extending also to weapons of mass destruction and misusing enormous resources badly needed for development, • many “invisible wars” Kothari, R. (1987). are suffered by the poor and oppressed people, manifested in mass misery, poverty, unemployment, homelessness, starvation and malnutrition, epidemics and poor health conditions, exploitation and oppression, racial and other discrimination, physical terror, organised injustice, disguised forms of violence, the denial or regular infringement of the democratic rights of citizens, women, youth, ethnic or religious minorities, etc., and last but not least, in the degradation of human environment, which means that • the “war against Nature”, i.e. the disturbance of ecological balance, wasteful management of natural resources, and large-scale pollution of our environment, is still going on, causing also losses and fatal dangers for human life. Behind global terrorism and “invisible wars” we find striking international and intrasociety inequities and distorted development patterns, the prevailing patterns of development, originating in the business environment of the most developed market economies, and motivated by the business interests of the transnational companies, are generating selfish individualism versus solidarity, cruel competition versus cooperation, and irrational consumerism, i.e. spending on luxurious, health- and environment-damaging items, versus basic needs orientation. , which tend to generate social as well as international tensions, thus paving the way for unrest and “visible” wars. It is a commonplace now that peace is not merely the absence of war. The prerequisites of a lasting peace between and within societies involve not only - though, of course, necessarily - demilitarisation, but also a systematic and gradual elimination of the roots of violence, of the causes of “invisible wars”, of the structural and institutional bases of large-scale international and intra-society inequalities, exploitation and oppression. Peace requires a process of social and national emancipation, a progressive, democratic transformation of societies and the world bringing about equal rights and opportunities for all people, sovereign participation and mutually advantageous co-operation among nations. It further requires a pluralistic democracy on global level with an appropriate system of proportional representation of the world society, articulation of diverse interests and their peaceful reconciliation, by non-violent conflict management, and thus also a global governance with a really global institutional system. Under the contemporary conditions of accelerating globalisation and deepening global interdependencies in our world, peace is indivisible in both time and space. It cannot exist if reduced to a period only after or before war, and cannot be safeguarded in one part of the world when some others suffer visible or invisible wars. Thus, peace requires, indeed, a new, demilitarised and democratic world order, which can provide equal opportunities for sustainable development. “Sustainability of development” (both on national and world level) is often interpreted as an issue of environmental protection only and reduced to the need for preserving the ecological balance and delivering the next generations not a destroyed Nature with overexhausted resources and polluted environment. However, no ecological balance can be ensured, unless the deep international development gap and intra-society inequalities are substantially reduced. Owing to global interdependencies there may exist hardly any “zero-sum-games”, in which one can gain at the expense of others, but, instead, the “negative-sum-games” tend to predominate, in which everybody must suffer, later or sooner, directly or indirectly, losses. Therefore, the actual question is not about “sustainability of development” but rather about the “sustainability of human life”, i.e. survival of mankind – because of ecological imbalance and globalised terrorism. When Professor Louk de la Rive Box was the president of EADI, one day we had an exchange of views on the state and future of development studies. We agreed that development studies are not any more restricted to the case of underdeveloped countries, as the developed ones (as well as the former “socialist” countries) are also facing development problems, such as those of structural and institutional (and even system-) transformation, requirements of changes in development patterns, and concerns about natural environment. While all these are true, today I would dare say that besides (or even instead of) “development studies” we must speak about and make “survival studies”. While the monetary, financial, and debt crises are cyclical, we live in an almost permanent crisis of the world society, which is multidimensional in nature, involving not only economic but also socio-psychological, behavioural, cultural and political aspects. The narrow-minded, election-oriented, selfish behaviour motivated by thirst for power and wealth, which still characterise the political leadership almost all over the world, paves the way for the final, last catastrophe. Under the circumstances provided by rapidly progressing science and technological revolutions, human society cannot survive unless such profound intra-society and international inequalities prevailing today are soon eliminated. Like a single spacecraft, the Earth can no longer afford to have a 'crew' divided into two parts: the rich, privileged, wellfed, well-educated, on the one hand, and the poor, deprived, starving, sick and uneducated, on the other. Dangerous 'zero-sum-games' (which mostly prove to be “negative-sum-games”) can hardly be played any more by visible or invisible wars in the world society. Because of global interdependencies, the apparent winner becomes also a loser. The real choice for the world society is between negative- and positive-sum-games: i.e. between, on the one hand, continuation of visible and “invisible wars”, as long as this is possible at all, and, on the other, transformation of the world order by demilitarisation and democratization. No ideological or terminological camouflage can conceal this real dilemma any more, which is to be faced not in the distant future, by the next generations, but in the coming years, because of global terrorism soon having nuclear and other mass destructive weapons, and also due to irreversible changes in natural environment.

# Adv 2

#### Adequate plutonium production in squo

**Whittington, science authr, Washington Post, 3-15-13**

(Mark, “DOE Restarts Plutonium-238 Production for NASA Space Probes,” Yahoo News, March 15, 2013, <http://news.yahoo.com/doe-restarts-plutonium-238-production-nasa-space-probes-183700436.html>, accessed 3/22/13, kns)

Popular Science is reporting that for the first time in more than two decades, the United States is producing plutonium-238. This particular form of plutonium is required for space probes such as the Mars Curiosity that run on radioisotope thermoelectric generator power sources. Plutonium-238 hard to come by for decades Popular Science notes that the American source for plutonium-238 dried up when the Savannah River nuclear site was shut down for environmental reasons in 1988. Since then, NASA has gotten a supply of the isotope to power various space probes. Congress has been a bit stingy in appropriating money to restart American production of plutonium-238. Nevertheless, the Department of Energy has been able to produce the material at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee. It is anticipated that three pounds per year will be produced, judged to be **adequate for NASA's future needs**. Why plutonium-238 is important According to a story in Space.com, NASA has used plutonium-238 in radioisotope thermoelectric generators since 1961. Space probes, including the Mars Curiosity, the New Horizons, current in route to Pluto, and Cassini all use some version of the RTG. The RTG works by using the heat generated by the decay of plutonium-238 to convert to electricity. This approach to powering spacecraft is considered useful where power requirements are too great to be satisfied with solar panels or the probe is too far distant from the sun to make such an approach practical. RTGs have also been used in Pioneer 10, Pioneer 11, Voyager 1, Voyager 2, Ulysses, Galileo, and every Apollo mission to the moon after Apollo 11. Apollo 11's experiment package and the Sojourner, Spirit, and Opportunity rovers contained heaters containing Plutonium-238.

#### DOE production ending plutonium shortage

**Dickinson, science writer, Universe Today, 3-20-13**

(David, “U.S. To Restart Plutonium Production for Deep Space Exploration,” March 20, 2013, <http://www.universetoday.com/100875/u-s-to-restart-plutonium-production-for-deep-space-exploration/>, accessed 3/22/13, kns)

The end of NASA’s plutonium shortage may be in sight. On Monday March 18th, NASA’s planetary science division head Jim Green announced that production of Plutonium-238 (Pu-238) by the United States Department of Energy (DOE) is currently in the test phases leading up to a restart of full scale production. “By the end of the calendar year, we’ll have a complete plan from the Department of Energy on how they’ll be able to satisfy our requirement of 1.5 to 2 kilograms a year.” Green said at the 44th Lunar and Planetary Science Conference being held in Woodlands, Texas this past Monday. This news comes none too soon. We’ve written previously on the impending Plutonium shortage and the consequences it has for future deep space exploration. Solar power is adequate in most cases when you explore the inner solar system, but when you venture out beyond the asteroid belt, you need nuclear power to do it. Production of the isotope Pu-238 was a fortunate consequence of the Cold War. First produced by Glen Seaborg in 1940, the weapons grade isotope of plutonium (-239) is produced via bombarding neptunium (which itself is a decay product of uranium-238) with neutrons. Use the same target isotope of Neptunium-237 in a fast reactor, and Pu-238 is the result. Pu-238 produces 280x times the decay heat at 560 watts per kilogram versus weapons grade Pu-239 and is ideal as a compact source of energy for deep space exploration. Since 1961, over 26 U.S. spacecraft have been launched carrying Multi-Mission Radioisotope Thermoelectric Generators (MMRTG, or formerly simply RTGs) as power sources and have explored every planet except Mercury. RTGs were used by the Apollo Lunar Surface Experiments Package (ALSEP) science payloads left on by the astronauts on the Moon, and Cassini, Mars Curiosity and New Horizons enroute to explore Pluto in July 2015 are all nuclear powered. Plutonium powered RTGs are the only technology that we have currently in use that can carry out deep space exploration. NASA’s Juno spacecraft will be the first to reach Jupiter in 2016 without the use of a nuclear-powered RTG, but it will need to employ 3 enormous 2.7 x 8.9 metre solar panels to do it. The problem is, plutonium production in the U.S. ceased in 1988 with the end of the Cold War. How much Plutonium-238 NASA and the DOE has stockpiled is classified, but it has been speculated that it has at most enough for one more large Flag Ship class mission and perhaps a small Scout class mission. Plus, once weapons grade plutonium-239 is manufactured, there’s no re-processing it the desired Pu-238 isotope. The plutonium that currently powers Curiosity across the surface of Mars was bought from the Russians, and that source ended in 2010. New Horizons is equipped with a spare MMRTG that was built for Cassini, which was launched in 1999. As an added bonus, plutonium powered missions often exceed expectations as well. For example, the Voyager 1 & 2 spacecraft had an original mission duration of five years and are now expected to continue well into their fifth decade of operation. Mars Curiosity doesn’t suffer from the issues of “dusty solar panels” that plagued Spirit and Opportunity and can operate through the long Martian winter. Incidentally, while the Spirit and Opportunity rovers were not nuclear powered, they did employ tiny pellets of plutonium oxide in their joints to stay warm, as well as radioactive curium to provide neutron sources in their spectrometers. It’s even quite possible that any alien intelligence stumbles upon the five spacecraft escaping our solar system (Pioneer 10 & 11, Voyagers 1 & 2, and New Horizons) could conceivably date their departure from Earth by measuring the decay of their plutonium power source. (Pu-238 has a half life of 87.7 years and eventually decays after transitioning through a long series of daughter isotopes into lead-206). The current production run of Pu-238 will be carried out at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) using its High Flux Isotope Reactor (HFIR). “Old” Pu-238 can also be revived by adding newly manufactured Pu-238 to it. “For every 1 kilogram, we really revive two kilograms of the older plutonium by mixing it… it’s a critical part of our process to be able to utilize our existing supply at the energy density we want it,” Green told a recent Mars exploration planning committee. Still, full target production of 1.5 kilograms per year may be some time off. For context, the Mars rover Curiosity utilizes 4.8 kilograms of Pu-238, and New Horizons contains 11 kilograms. No missions to the outer planets have left Earth since the launch of Curiosity in November 2011, and the next mission likely to sport an RTG is the proposed Mars 2020 rover. Ideas on the drawing board such as a Titan lake lander and a Jupiter Icy Moons mission would all be nuclear powered.

#### Current plutonium production sufficient to meet NASA’s goals- tests improving production capabilities

**McKee, space and physical science news editor, 3-15-13**

(Maggie, “Plutonium tests offer hope for dark space missions,” New Scientist magazine, March 15, 2013, <http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn23285-plutonium-tests-offer-hope-for-dark-space-missions.html>, accessed 3/22/13, kns)

The future is looking brighter for missions to the solar system's dark corners. Plutonium needed to power the spacecraft that cannot rely on solar power has been created in the US for the first time in 25 years – albeit in small quantities. Some destinations, such as the outer solar system or the polar regions of Mars, receive too little sunlight for ambitious missions to use solar panels there. Instead, heat from the decay of the radioactive isotope plutonium-238 is needed to generate electricity. Unfortunately, stores of the stuff are running out. The US stopped producing the isotope – which had been generated as a by-product of cold-war nuclear weapons programmes – in 1988. Its remaining stocks have been estimated at just 16.8 kilograms. "Without a restart of plutonium-238 production, it will be impossible for the United States, or any other country, to conduct certain important types of planetary missions after this decade," concluded a US National Research Council report in 2011. New beginning Now, however, the US has taken the first steps towards restarting its plutonium-238 production line. A few grams of the isotope have been created in tests at the Department of Energy's Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee in the past year, and the results suggest the lab could scale up to 1.5 kg annually, in line to meet many, if not all, of NASA's goals. In the tests inside a reactor at Oak Ridge, neutrons were fired at an aluminium target filled with radioactive neptunium-237. Later, the resulting plutonium-238 was chemically separated from the neptunium target, which was then reused. The tests will continue for the rest of this year, with the aim of finding the best shape and density of the target for the reactor and improving ways of extracting the plutonium produced, says Tim Powers, director of the lab's non-reactor nuclear facilities division. Glove box "It's a very well-defined problem, but it's an engineering challenge to optimise all these things," says Jeff Binder, the lab's associate director for nuclear science and engineering. Performing such tests and upgrading facilities at both Oak Ridge and Idaho National Laboratory in Idaho Falls to produce useful amounts of plutonium-238 could cost upwards of $100 million, though the US Department of Energy has yet to finalise its cost estimates. Powers says the main upgrade needed at Oak Ridge is the installation of several stainless steel "glove boxes" that would allow workers to safely make the neptunium targets. "This is probably the most significant thing that needs to happen to go to 1.5 kilograms per year," he says. The US Department of Energy aims to ramp up to that production level by late 2017.

#### Plutonium production solves shortages

**Ferro, PopSci Correspondent, 13**

(Shaunacy, “NASA Resumes Production Of Plutonium-238 Space Fuel After 25 Years”, <http://www.popsci.com/science/article/2013-03/first-time-cold-war-us-making-plutonium-238>, 03/14/2013, da: 03/28/2013, lmm)

For the first time in more than two decades, the United States can put a "Made in the USA" stamp on non-weapons grade plutonium, Discovery News reports. Plutonium-238 is an important fuel source for the radioisotope power systems that are used in spacecraft like the Mars Curiosity Rover and the New Horizon spacecraft that's on its way to Pluto. As plutonium-238 decays, it gives off enough heat to generate electricity and keep all the expensive parts of a spacecraft warm in the cold, dark nether regions of deep space. Until 1988, the U.S. produced its plutonium-238 (not to be confused with plutonium-239, the isotope in nuclear weapons) as part of its Cold War nuclear shenanigans. After the Savannah River Site, a major contributor of plutonium-238, shut down because of environmental issues, we turned to Russia for our plutonium needs, but that supply has run out as well. Since 2009, we've been wringing our hands over how to get enough of the fuel to power our future space exploration. Congress threw NASA $10 million of its requested $30 million budget to start production, but denied the Department of Energy's funding requests three years in a row. In April, officials at the DOE finally announced production was underway, but getting supplies up to snuff could take up to eight years. That process seems to be off to a good start, luckily. Jim Green, director of NASA's Planetary Science Division, announced at a Mars exploration planning meeting that the DOE has successfully generated plutonium at Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee, according to Discovery News. Green said he expects a little more than three pounds of plutonium to be generated per year. New supplies of plutonium could be mixed with the small existing supply of U.S. plutonium to bring the depleted plutonium up to the necessary energy density.

#### And the President signed it

**White House Press Secretary, 2-26-13**

(“Statement by the Press Secretary on H.R. 933,” March 26, 2013, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/03/26/statement-press-secretary-hr-933>, accessed 3/28/13, kns)

On Tuesday, March 26, 2013, the President signed into law: H.R. 933, the "Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013," in which Divisions A through E provide fiscal year (FY) 2013 full-year appropriations through September 30, 2013, for the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Homeland Security, Justice, and Veterans Affairs, as well as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, and other related agencies; Division F provides for further continuing FY 2013 funding through September 30, 2013 for the remaining projects and activities of the Federal Government funded through discretionary appropriations not covered in Divisions A through E; and Division G includes across-the-board reductions for FY 2013 discretionary appropriations contained in Divisions A through F to assure compliance with the discretionary spending limits.

#### The bill funds plutonium production for RTGs AND restores funding for further space exploration and planetary science

**H.R. 933: Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013**

(113th Congress, 2013, <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/113/hr933/text>, accessed 3/28/13, kns)

National Aeronautics and Space Administration science For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of science research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support, and services; maintenance and repair, facility planning and design; space flight, spacecraft control, and communications activities; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901 and 5902 of title 5, United States Code; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, $5,144,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which up to $14,500,000 shall be available for a reimbursable agreement with the Department of Energy for the purpose of re-establishing facilities to produce fuel required for radioisotope thermoelectric generators to enable future missions: Provided, That $75,000,000 shall be for pre-formulation and/or formulation activities for a mission that meets the science goals outlined for the Jupiter Europa mission in the most recent planetary science decadal survey: Provided further, That the formulation and development costs (with development cost as defined under section 30104 of title 51, United States Code) for the James Webb Space Telescope shall not exceed $8,000,000,000: Provided further, That should the individual identified under subsection (c)(2)(E) of section 30104 of title 51, United States Code, as responsible for the James Webb Space Telescope determine that the development cost of the program is likely to exceed that limitation, the individual shall immediately notify the Administrator and the increase shall be treated as if it meets the 30 percent threshold described in subsection (f) of section 30104. aeronautics For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of aeronautics research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support, and services; maintenance and repair, facility planning and design; space flight, spacecraft control, and communications activities; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901 and 5902 of title 5, United States Code; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, $570,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014. space technology For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of space research and technology development activities, including research, development, operations, support, and services; maintenance and repair, facility planning and design; space flight, spacecraft control, and communications activities; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901 and 5902 of title 5, United States Code; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, $642,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014. exploration For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of exploration research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support, and services; maintenance and repair, facility planning and design; space flight, spacecraft control, and communications activities; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901 and 5902 of title 5, United States Code; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, $3,887,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That not less than $1,197,000,000 shall be for the Orion Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle: Provided further, That not less than $1,857,000,000 shall be for the Space Launch System, which shall have a lift capability not less than 130 tons and which shall have an upper stage and other core elements developed simultaneously: Provided further, That of the funds made available for the Space Launch System, $1,454,200,000 shall be for launch vehicle development and $402,800,000 shall be for exploration ground systems: Provided further, That funds made available for the Orion Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle and Space Launch System are in addition to funds provided for these programs under the ‘Construction and Environmental Compliance and Restoration’ heading: Provided further, That $525,000,000 shall be for commercial spaceflight activities: Provided further, That $308,000,000 shall be for exploration research and development. space operations For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of space operations research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support and services; space flight, spacecraft control and communications activities, including operations, production, and services; maintenance and repair, facility planning and design; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901 and 5902 of title 5, United States Code; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, $3,953,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014. education For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in carrying out aerospace and aeronautical education research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support, and services; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901 and 5902 of title 5, United States Code; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, $125,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014, of which $18,000,000 shall be for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research and $40,000,000 shall be for the National Space Grant College program. cross agency support For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of science, aeronautics, exploration, space operations and education research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support, and services; maintenance and repair, facility planning and design; space flight, spacecraft control, and communications activities; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by sections 5901 and 5902 of title 5, United States Code; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $63,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, $2,823,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2014: Provided, That not less than $39,100,000 shall be available for independent verification and validation activities.

#### Multiple protections solve the impact.

**Bailey, Reason’s science correspondent, 2011**

(Ronald, “Internet vulnerability to attacks exaggerated, says new report”, 1-18, <http://reason.com/archives/2011/01/18/cyberwar-is-harder-than-it>, ldg)

Modern life is made possible by sets of tightly interconnected systems, supplying us with electricity, water, natural gas, automobile fuels, sewage treatment, food, telecommunications, finance, and emergency response. In wartime, combatants have traditionally sought to disrupt their enemies’ supply systems, generally by blowing them up. Nowadays, many of these systems are increasingly directed and monitored through the Internet. Would it be possible for our enemies to disrupt these vital systems by “blowing up” the Internet? The Obama administration is evidently worried about this possibility. In May 2009, the administration issued its Cyberspace Policy Review [PDF] which declared, “Threats to cyberspace pose one of the most serious economic and national security challenges of the 21st Century for the United States and our allies.” A year later the U.S. Cyber Command was launched with the aim of protecting U.S. information technology systems and establishing U.S. military dominance in cyberspace. A new market research report identifies the cyberwar sector as “single greatest growth market in the defense and security sector,” forecasting that global spending on cyberwarfare will reach $12.5 billion this year. A new report, Reducing Systemic Cybersecurity Risk, [PDF] by British researchers Ian Brown and Peter Sommer for the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) evaluates threats to the security of the Internet and other aspects of cyberspace, including hacking, viruses, trojans, denial-of-service, distributed denial of service using botnets, root-kits, and disruptive social engineering techniques. Such weapons have become ubiquitous and already used in government and industrial espionage, identity theft, web-defacements, extortion, system hijacking, and service blockading. The recent denial of service attacks on Estonia and Georgia give us some sense of the effectiveness of cyber attacks. As James Lewis at the Center for Strategic and International Studies noted, [PDF] “These countries came under limited cyber attack as part of larger conflicts with Russia, but in neither case were there casualties, loss of territory, destruction, or serious disruption of critical services.” Brown and Sommer conclude, “It is unlikely that there will ever be a true cyberwar.” By cyberwar, they mean one fought solely over and with information technologies. Why? Because it takes a lot of effort to figure out new vulnerabilities in already protected critical systems and the effects of an attack are difficult to predict, including blowback on the perpetrators. More importantly, they note, “There is no strategic reason why an aggressor would limit themselves to only one class of weaponry.” In a real war, cyberattacks would be an adjunct to conventional efforts to blow up critical infrastructure. Because attacks can be launched from any set of computers, attackers can remain hidden. Consequently, a strategy of deterrence will not work in cyberwarfare because the target for retaliation is unknown. This means that resilience is the main defense against cyberweapons, a combination of preventive measures and contingency plans for a quick post-attack recovery. If cyberwarfare against infrastructure was easy, terrorists like Al Qaeda would have already tried the tactic against us and our NATO allies. Brown and Sommer observe that the Internet and the physical telecommunications infrastructure were designed to be robust and self-healing, so that failures in one part are routed around. “You have to be cautious when hearing from people engaging in fear-mongering about huge blackouts and collapses of critical infrastructures via the Internet,” says University of Toronto cyberwarfare expert Ronald Deibert in the January/February 2011 issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. “There is a lot of redundancy in the networks; it’s not a simple thing to turn off the power grid.” In addition, our experience with current forms of malware is somewhat reassuring. Responses to new malware have generally been found and made available within days and few denial of service attacks have lasted more than a day. In addition, many critical networks such as those carrying financial transactions are not connected to the Internet requiring insider information to make them vulnerable. While not everyone uses up-to-date malware detection, most government agencies, major businesses, and many individuals do, which means that would-be attackers must take the time and effort to find new flaws and develop new techniques. For example, the success of the Stuxnet worm that attacked and disabled Iranian nuclear centrifuges required very extensive intelligence gathering and knowledge of specific software flaws as well as someone able to walk into the facilities with an infected USB drive. Brown and Sommers urge governments to ratify the CyberCrime Convention. The chief treaty holdouts are Russia and China, countries from which many recent cyberattacks appear to have originated. “We should not forget that many of the countries that are havens for cybercrime have invested billions in domestic communications monitoring to supplement an already extensive set of police tools for political control,” notes James Lewis. “The notion that a cybercriminal in one of these countries operates without the knowledge and thus tacit consent of the government is difficult to accept. A hacker who turned his sights from Tallinn to the Kremlin would have only hours before his service were cut off, his door was smashed down and his computer confiscated.” Another fruitful way to address emerging cyber threats suggested by the authors is to strengthen connections between national Computer Emergency Response Teams (CERTs). CERT experts operate as a kind of early warning system who also devise software fixes to stop the spread of new malware. And they think that public policy, including procurement, can be used to encourage the development of properly tested hardware and software. While blowing up the Internet probably won't happen, espionage, hacking, and malware will be with us always. Whatever we do to defend against them, will also defend against the threat of cyberwarfare.

#### No impact—biodiversity loss is insignificant

**Sagoff, Maryland public policy senior scholar, 1997**

(Mark, “INSTITUTE OF BILL OF RIGHTS LAW SYMPOSIUM DEFINING TAKINGS: PRIVATE PROPERTY AND THE FUTURE OF GOVERNMENT REGULATION: MUDDLE OR MUDDLE THROUGH? TAKINGS JURISPRUDENCE MEETS THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT”, March, 38 Wm and Mary L. Rev. 825, lexis, ldg)

To be sure, if extinctions continue at present rates indefinitely, at some point there may be too few viable species ready, willing, and able to substitute for those that have been lost. How much of a "buffer" exists? How many "extra" rivets are in the wings? Many ecologists follow Paul Ehrlich, Peter Raven, and others in declaring that with every extinction we run the risk of calamitous damage to the environment. n342 Although one may agree with ecologists such as Ehrlich and Raven that the earth stands on the brink of an episode of massive extinction, it may not follow from this grim fact that human beings will suffer as a result. On the contrary, skeptics such as science writer Colin Tudge have challenged biologists to explain why we need more than a tenth of the 10 to 100 million species that grace the earth. Noting that "cultivated systems often out-produce wild systems by 100-fold or more," Tudge declared that "the argument that humans need the variety of other species is, when you think about it, a theological one." n343 Tudge observed that "the elimination of all but a tiny minority of our fellow creatures does not affect the material well-being of humans one iota." n344 This skeptic challenged ecologists to list more than 10,000 species (other than unthreatened microbes) that are essential to ecosystem productivity or functioning. n345 "The human species could survive just as well if 99.9% of our fellow creatures went extinct, provided only that we retained the appropriate 0.1% that we need." n346 [\*906] The monumental Global Biodiversity Assessment ("the Assessment") identified two positions with respect to redundancy of species. "At one extreme is the idea that each species is unique and important, such that its removal or loss will have demonstrable consequences to the functioning of the community or ecosystem." n347 The authors of the Assessment, a panel of eminent ecologists, endorsed this position, saying it is "unlikely that there is much, if any, ecological redundancy in communities over time scales of decades to centuries, the time period over which environmental policy should operate." n348 These eminent ecologists rejected the opposing view, "the notion that species overlap in function to a sufficient degree that removal or loss of a species will be compensated by others, with negligible overall consequences to the community or ecosystem." n349 Other biologists believe, however, that species are so fabulously redundant in the ecological functions they perform that the life-support systems and processes of the planet and ecological processes in general will function perfectly well with fewer of them, certainly fewer than the millions and millions we can expect to remain even if every threatened organism becomes extinct. n350 Even the kind of sparse and miserable world depicted in the movie Blade Runner could provide a "sustainable" context for the human economy as long as people forgot their aesthetic and moral commitment to the glory and beauty of the natural world. n351 The Assessment makes this point. "Although any ecosystem contains hundreds to thousands of species interacting among themselves and their physical environment, the emerging consensus is that the system is driven by a small number of . . . biotic variables on whose interactions the balance of species are, in a sense, carried along." n352 [\*907] To make up your mind on the question of the functional redundancy of species, consider an endangered species of bird, plant, or insect and ask how the ecosystem would fare in its absence. The fact that the creature is endangered suggests an answer: it is already in limbo as far as ecosystem processes are concerned. What crucial ecological services does the black-capped vireo, for example, serve? Are any of the species threatened with extinction necessary to the provision of any ecosystem service on which humans depend? If so, which ones are they? Ecosystems and the species that compose them have changed, dramatically, continually, and totally in virtually every part of the United States. There is little ecological similarity, for example, between New England today and the land where the Pilgrims died. n353 In view of the constant reconfiguration of the biota, one may wonder why Americans have not suffered more as a result of ecological catastrophes. The cast of species in nearly every environment changes constantly-local extinction is commonplace in nature-but the crops still grow. Somehow, it seems, property values keep going up on Martha's Vineyard in spite of the tragic disappearance of the heath hen. One might argue that the sheer number and variety of creatures available to any ecosystem buffers that system against stress. Accordingly, we should be concerned if the "library" of creatures ready, willing, and able to colonize ecosystems gets too small. (Advances in genetic engineering may well permit us to write a large number of additions to that "library.") In the United States as in many other parts of the world, however, the number of species has been increasing dramatically, not decreasing, as a result of human activity. This is because the hordes of exotic species coming into ecosystems in the United States far exceed the number of species that are becoming extinct. Indeed, introductions may outnumber extinctions by more than ten to one, so that the United States is becoming more and more species-rich all the time largely as a result of human action. n354

# 3

#### No impact to space miscalc- no escalation and clarification

**Lambakis, senior defense analyst, National Institute for Public Policy, 1**

(Steven, “Space Weapons: Refuting the Critics,” The Hoover Institution Policy Review, February 1, 2001, <http://www.hoover.org/publications/policy-review/article/6612>, accessed 3/29/13, kns)

Those who believe we run extraordinary risks stemming from clouded perceptions and misunderstandings in an age of computerized space warfare might want to take a look at some real-world situations of high volatility in which potentially provocative actions took place. Take, for example, the tragedies involving the USS Stark and USS Vincennes. In May 1987, an Iraqi F-1 Mirage jet fighter attacked the Stark on patrol to protect neutral shipping in the Persian Gulf, killing 37 sailors. Iraq, a "near-ally" of the United States at the time, had never before attacked a U.S. ship. Analysts concluded that misperception and faulty assumptions led to Iraq’s errant attack. The memory of the USS Stark no doubt preoccupied the crew of the USS Vincennes, which little over a year later, in July 1988, was also on patrol in hostile Persian Gulf waters. The Vincennes crew was involved in a "half war" against Iran, and at the time was fending off surface attacks from small Iranian gunboats. Operating sophisticated technical systems under high stress and rules of engagement that allowed for anticipatory self-defense, the advanced Aegis cruiser fired anti-aircraft missiles at what it believed to be an Iranian military aircraft set on an attack course. The aircraft turned out to be a commercial Iran Air flight, and 290 people perished owing to mistakes in identification and communications. To these examples we may add a long list of tactical blunders growing out of ambiguous circumstances and faulty intelligence, including the U.S. bombing in 1999 of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade during Kosovo operations. Yet though these tragic actions occurred in near-war or tinderbox situations, they did not escalate or exacerbate local instability. The world also survived U.S.-Soviet "near encounters" during the 1948 Berlin crisis, the 1961 Cuban missile crisis, and the 1967 and 1973 Arab-Israeli wars. Guarded diplomacy won the day in all cases. Why would disputes affecting space be any different? In other words, it is not at all self-evident that a sudden loss of a communications satellite, for example, would precipitate a wider-scale war or make warfare termination impossible. In the context of U.S.-Russian relations, communications systems to command authorities and forces are redundant. Urgent communications may be routed through land lines or the airwaves. Other means are also available to perform special reconnaissance missions for monitoring a crisis or compliance with an armistice. While improvements are needed, our ability to know what transpires in space is growing — so we are not always in the dark. The burden is on the critics, therefore, to present convincing analogical evidence to support the notion that, in wartime or peacetime, attempts by the United States to control space or exploit orbits for defensive or offensive purposes would increase significantly the chances for crisis instability or nuclear war. In Washington and other capitals, the historical pattern is to use every available means to clarify perceptions and to consider decisions that might lead to war or escalation with care, not dispatch.

#### No escalation AND defense systems prevent

Dolman and Cooper, professor, Comparative Military Studies, and director, Strategic Defense Initiative, 11

(Everett and Henry, “Toward a Theory of Space Power, Chapter 19: Increasing the Military Uses of Space,” <http://www.ndu.edu/press/space-Ch19.html>, accessed 3/27/13, kns)

A limited strike capability from space would allow for the engagement of the highest threat and the most fleeting targets wherever they presented themselves on the globe, regardless of the intention of the perpetrator. The case of a ballistic missile carrying nuclear warheads is exemplary. Two decades ago, the most dangerous threat facing America (and the world) was a massive exchange of nuclear warheads that could destroy all life on the planet. Since a perfect defense was not achievable, negotiators agreed to no defense at all, on the assumption that reasonable leaders would restrain themselves from global catastrophe. Today, a massive exchange is less likely than at any period of the Cold War, in part because of significant reductions in the primary nations' nuclear arsenals. The most likely and most dangerous threat comes from a single or limited missile launch, and from sources that are unlikely to be either rational or predictable. The first is an accidental launch, a threat we avoided making protections against due to the potentially destabilizing effect on the precarious Cold War balance. That an accidental launch, by definition undeterrable, would today hit its target is almost incomprehensible. More likely than an accidental launch is the intentional launch of one or a few missiles, either by a nonstate actor (a terrorist or "rogue boat captain" as the scenario was described in the early 1980s) or a rogue state attempting to maximize damage as a prelude to broader conflict. This is especially likely in the underdeveloped theories pertaining to deterring third-party states. The United States can do nothing today to prevent India from launching a nuclear attack against Pakistan (or vice versa) except threaten retaliation. If Iran should launch a nuclear missile at Israel, or in a preemptory strike Israel should attempt the reverse, America and the world could only sit back and watch, hoping that a potentially world-destroying conflict did not spin out of control. When President Reagan announced his desire for a missile shield in 1983, critics pointed out that even if a 99-percent-reliable defense from space could be achieved, a 10,000-warhead salvo by the Soviet Union still allowed for the detonation of 100 nuclear bombs in American cities—and both we and the Soviets had enough missiles to make such an attack plausible. But if a single missile were launched out of the blue from deep within the Asian landmass today, for whatever reason, a space-based missile defense system with 99-percent reliability would be a godsend. And if a U.S. space defense could intercept a single Scud missile launched by terrorists from a ship near America's coasts before it detonated a nuclear warhead 100 miles up—creating an electromagnetic pulse that shuts down America's powergrid, halts America's banking and commerce, and reduces the battlefield for America's military to third world status8—it might provide for the very survival of our way of life.

#### Zero risk of war

Hoffman, Foreign Policy Contributing editor, 2012

(David, October 22, "Hey, Big Spender," [www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/10/22/hey\_big\_spender?page=full](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/10/22/hey_big_spender?page=full), d/a 2-8-13, ads)

Despite tensions that flare up, the United States and Russia are no longer enemies; the chance of nuclear war or surprise attack is nearly zero. We trade in each other's equity markets. Russia has the largest audience of Facebook users in Europe, and is open to the world in a way the Soviet Union never was.

#### Common interests prevent escalation

Sestanovich, Colombia University International Diplomacy Professor, 2008

(Stephen, Council on Foreign Relations Senior Fellow, Nov/Dec, "What Has Moscow Done?" <http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/fa/v87i6/02.html>, d/a 2-8-13, ads)

Against this backdrop, Russia's invasion of a small neighbor might have seemed to be final confirmation of the view that Russia has become, in the words of the British economist Robert Skidelsky, "the world's foremost revisionist power." And yet, for all the recent references to the Sudetenland and the crushing of the Prague Spring, Western governments have made clear that such parallels will not guide their response. Government officials and pundits alike have been coupling their denunciations of Moscow with assurances that they want to work with it in advancing common interests, whether on nuclear proliferation, terrorism, energy security, drug trafficking, or climate change. The more these issues are invoked, the less one should expect U.S. policy toward Russia to change. Harry Truman, it might be recalled, did not usually speak of his determination to work with Joseph Stalin. For two decades, the idea that the United States needs Russia for practical reasons has led Washington, even in moments of shock and confusion over Russia's actions, to want to keep relations with Russia from becoming any worse than necessary. Although U.S. policymakers have considered Moscow a high-maintenance partner with whom getting to yes is extremely frustrating and sometimes almost hopeless, they have never been ready to give up on the effort. Even Russia's war with Georgia has not changed this outlook, and for the foreseeable future probably nothing will.

#### US-Russia tensions are just saber-rattling- best experts inside Moscow agree- no risk of war

Young, Boston Globe and Reason staff writer, April 2009

[Cathy, "Unclenching the First," Reason, http://www.reason.com/news/show/131970.html, accessed June 2009, mss]

It could be that the conflict is more contrived than real on Russia’s end. The belief that Kremlin rhetoric about the American threat is a faux paranoia, calculated to enable bullying at home and abroad, is shared by numerous commentators inside Russia, from the Carnegie Endowment’s Lilia Shevtsova to former top-level Soviet arms negotiator Gen. Vladimir Dvorkin.

#### No risk of war- even a new cold war is inconceivable- there won’t even be frosty relations- AND war is impossible because Russia knows it has no allies

Grant, Centre for European Reform director, November 2008

[Charles, "How to Handle the New Russia," CER, http://www.cer.org.uk/articles/62\_grant.html, accessed June 2009, mss]

But despite the bluster and rhetoric, another Cold War is inconceivable. One reason, as President Medvedev himself observed, is that "the Cold War was an ideological confrontation, which is not the case today". Russia does not offer a particularly attractive political or economic model to other countries. Another reason is that Russia is too weak. Its economy is less than 3 per cent of world GDP (on a purchasing power parity basis) and is forecast (by the Economist Intelligence Unit) to remain below 3 per cent in 2030. By then, the EIU predicts, China will be at 23 per cent of world GDP, the US at 17 per cent, and the EU-27 at 16 per cent. That affects Russia's military potential - today it spends only a tenth of what the US spends on defence. In most parts of Latin America, Africa and Asia, China rather than Russia is seen as the power that could rival the US. Although Russia's economy has been growing fast, at around 7 per cent a year, it suffers from grave structural weaknesses: over-dependence on hydrocarbon exports, low manufacturing productivity, weak service industries and a poor record on innovation. The leading Russian companies know that in order to succeed at a global level they need to buy foreign firms, raise money on international markets and hire the best talent. Even Russia's oil and gas companies, whose output is beginning to decline, cannot thrive without foreign technology, expertise and capital. They lack the financial muscle to invest in major exploration projects or overseas acquisitions without access to foreign credit markets. None of them can build a deep-water oil or gas rig without foreign partners. Medvedev seems to understand that a prolonged period of frosty relations with the West would damage his plans for modernising Russia. "Any conflict evidently creates problems for the economy," he said. "But when we have to choose between protecting the lives and dignity of our citizens, no matter where, and economic value, you know our choice." Russia's problem is not only economic weakness, but also strategic isolation. For all the talk of a multi-vector world, and the support Moscow has given to authoritarian regimes like Venezuela, Burma and Uzbekistan, it has almost no friends. The only country that followed Russia into recognising the independence of South Ossetia and Abkhazia was Nicaragua. Even Belarus baulked at that. As the next article shows, Beijing's relations with Moscow are far from warm.